



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2020

No. 134

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, You have taken care of us in the years that have gone. We honor You for Your glory and strength. May we place our hope in You and never forget that You can also sustain us in the future.

Today, give our Senators the wisdom to trust You in the small things, realizing that faithfulness with the least prepares them for fidelity with the much. As they seek to be stewards of Your justice, mercy, and grace, use them to fulfill Your purposes. Lord, given them a love for Your wisdom and a passion to be guided by your precepts.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, now that the United Kingdom has separated from the European Union, it is our opportunity to sit down with the United Kingdom and do some business. Therefore, I am pleased that the United States and the United Kingdom are making strides in our negotiations to complete a free trade agreement.

Our two countries, as you know, have a centuries-old relationship. That relationship will be further strengthened by a comprehensive deal that presents economic opportunities for our farmers, our manufacturers, and our service providers to the benefit of both sides of the Atlantic.

I will continue to insist that an agreement reached between our two countries will allow us to reach our full potential as trading partners, particularly when it comes to agricultural trade.

The United Kingdom has been subject to very restrictive European Union rules that have no scientific basis. We call those sanitary and phytosanitary rules.

I urge the administration to work with the United Kingdom negotiators to achieve greater marketing access for U.S. farmers. In other words, I am tired of the EU restrictions that we have had over the last couple of decades on our GMO grains.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, when the Senate passed the CARES Act back in March, we were trying to prepare the Nation for economic paralysis and the medical battle of the century at the very same time. Hospitals, healthcare providers, small businesses, and working families needed help fast, and the Senate stepped up in historic fashion.

For months, our legislation has helped cushion the pain of this crisis from coast to coast, but our Nation is not finished with this fight. More Americans are dying every day. Millions and millions are unemployed. And

the institutions of American life cannot stay totally shut down until our race for a vaccine hits the finish line.

Our Nation needs to smartly and safely reopen while keeping up the medical battle. We need to get kids safely back to school and adults safely back to work without losing ground in the healthcare fight.

The coronavirus does not care that we are divided. The coronavirus will not care if Washington Democrats decide it suits their partisan goals to let relief run dry. The American people are hurting, and Congress should have their backs.

On Monday, I laid down a marker to shape the bipartisan conversations that need to happen now—not a loony, ideological fantasy like the House Democrats bill from a few months ago, which would have cut taxes for rich people, raised taxes on small business, and provided no additional round for the Paycheck Protection Program. No, serious talks actually require a serious starting point.

That is why we wrote a serious bill containing largely bipartisan policies. It has another round of cash for households—more than \$3,000 for an eligible family of four, with even more support for adult dependents; another round of additional Federal unemployment benefits assistance, which would otherwise simply expire; and another targeted round of the Paycheck Protection Program to prevent even more layoffs and keep paychecks coming to American workers. It has powerful new incentives to jump-start rehiring, bring down unemployment, and create safe workplaces for workers and customers. It has more support for hospitals and health providers; more support for testing, PPE, and diagnostics; and more resources for the sprint toward a vaccine. It has historic support for schools to reopen—a higher dollar amount than House Democrats managed to propose in their bill, which costs three times as much as ours.

• This “buller” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4553

And—uniting all three pillars of kids, jobs, and healthcare—we have legal protection for medical workers, schools, nonprofits, and businesses so that well-connected trial lawyers can't get even richer off of stopping the recovery in its tracks.

This is a more-than-fair, more-than-bipartisan framework for Democrats to engage with. The only reason I can see that Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leader would sabotage negotiations is if, as some concluded when they killed police reform in June, they actually think bipartisan progress for the country would hurt their own political chances. That is why I said a few days ago that we would quickly learn whether the American people would be getting the responsible Democratic Party from March or the cynical, obstructionist Democratic Party from June that blocked police reform. So let's review the early going.

Almost the instant we put out this proposal—which would send thousands of dollars in cash to families and even more cash to unemployed people—the Democratic leader proclaimed that “those Republican, hard-right money people . . . don't want the Federal Government to help anybody.”

A trillion dollar proposal for kids, jobs, and healthcare just proves Republicans don't want to help anyone.

Yesterday, after meeting with the administration, the Speaker of the House said this “isn't a negotiation.”

So here we go again. It is the script from police reform all over again.

We have had weeks of talk from Democrats about the urgency of the issue, weeks of Democrats thundering that people will be hurt if we don't act. But then, when it is time to actually make a law, Democrats would rather keep political issues alive than find a bipartisan way to resolve them.

Take the issue of additional Federal unemployment insurance. For weeks now, it has been clear to a majority of Americans that we should not pay people more to stay home than we pay people who continue working.

Should we have generous unemployment insurance in this crisis? Of course. Republicans want to continue the Federal supplement at eight times the level that Democrats themselves put in place during the last recession.

But, obviously, we should not be taxing the essential workers who have kept working so the government can pay their neighbors a higher salary to stay home.

Let me say that again. We should not be taxing the essential workers who have kept working so the government can pay their neighbors a higher salary to stay home.

Until about 5 minutes ago, this was not a controversial opinion. Democrats shared it with us. The House Democrat majority leader said yesterday: “That's an argument that . . . has some validity to it. . . . It's not \$600 or bust.”

A few days earlier, our Democratic colleague Senator COONS said he

thought we would be “finding some path forward” with a different dollar figure.

The day before yesterday, our colleague Senator CARDIN said: “What is the right number? Well, we certainly understand we don't want someone to have higher benefits than what someone can make working.”

At the State level, the Democratic Governor of Connecticut agrees. This is what he said: “I think sometimes it discourages work. . . . I would put off this extra \$600 true-up they're talking about. . . . I don't think we need that.”

That is the Democratic Governor of Connecticut.

Like I said, it is not controversial. The Congressional Budget Office says that five out of six recipients of this aid—83 percent—receive more to stay home than they made on the job.

Let me say that one more time. The Congressional Budget Office says that five out of six recipients of this aid—83 percent—receive more to stay home than they made on the job. We all know that is not fair, and it is not workable in a reopening job market. We have already heard from small business owners who had trouble reopening because it would be financially irrational for their employees to come back.

This is why Republicans propose to continue providing Federal aid—continue providing hundreds of dollars per week—but do it in a more targeted way while providing even more incentives for rehiring.

But now the Speaker of the House apparently signals she rejects this bipartisan consensus and will not let a package go forward unless we continue paying people more not to work. That is apparently the Speaker's position—that she will not let a package go forward unless we continue paying people more not to work. That is what Speaker PELOSI apparently signaled yesterday: No money for schools, no money for households, no second round of the PPP, no more money for hospitals or testing, nothing at all unless we continue to pay people more not to work.

If the Democrats don't get to continue taxing essential workers to pay other people more to stay home, then nobody gets a dime.

To put it gently, that is a completely unhinged position. Sixty-two percent of Americans say that paying people extra to remain unemployed creates the wrong incentive. A Democratic Governor says he doesn't want that continuing. Her own deputy, the House Democratic majority leader, said yesterday that there should be room to negotiate.

But Speaker PELOSI is literally moving the goalposts so fast that even Democrats can't keep up, and now she apparently feels that any rescue package will have to be to the political left of her own Democratic majority leader, to the political left of the Democratic Governor of Connecticut or she will not even consider it. She will just refuse to

legislate until the election and wish the American families good luck in dealing with the pandemic.

These are not the positions of people who are putting the common good above politics. These are not the positions of people who actually want to reach an agreement to save Federal unemployment insurance from completely expiring.

The American people deserve better than this. The American people cannot afford for Democrats in Congress to have decided in June that they are finished legislating until November—not during a crisis like this. The country needs help. The country needs action. If Democratic leaders decide they will not negotiate, they will answer to the American people.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Derek Kan, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, over the past 3 months, as Americans stayed home and forfeited their routines and their livelihoods to combat the spread of the virus, as essential workers risked their safety and their families' safety, as 50 million Americans filed unemployment claims, as small businesses folded, and as the disease spread rapidly through the summer, the Republican majority paused on addressing COVID-19 while it confirmed more rightwing judges. Americans pitched in and sacrificed, and many suffered greatly while the Senate Republicans kept their assembly line

of extreme judicial nominees humming along and did little else.

Now, after an interminable delay, the Senate Republicans have finally admitted that the country needs relief, but they can't even get their act together to produce a halfway legitimate legislative proposal. We all witnessed a week and a half of infighting on the Republican side as the country careened toward several cliffs created by Republican delay. The Republicans bickered amongst themselves as the moratorium on evictions expired, State and local governments shed jobs and cut public services, and the last enhanced unemployment checks went out the door.

When the Republicans finally convinced themselves they were ready to unveil a plan, instead of presenting a single, coherent bill, the Republicans released several incongruent drafts that were littered with corporate giveaways, K Street handouts, and Presidential pet projects.

Some Republicans proposed billions of dollars for large agribusinesses and defense contractors but not a dime to help American families stay in their homes. The Republican bill has a tax break for three-martini lunches but no food assistance for hungry kids. There is \$2 billion for a new FBI building, the location of which will increase the value of the Trump hotel, but no funding to help State and local governments retain teachers, firefighters, busdrivers, and other public employees. There is no support for Medicaid, for nursing homes, or for those with disabilities.

The proposals to support our health system and to meet our testing needs are wildly insufficient.

If you are one of the 20 to 30 million Americans who lost their jobs through no fault of their own and you can't find work, Senate Republicans think you have it too good right now. You should take a 30-percent pay cut, Republicans are saying.

This is not a serious proposal for a country in the midst of a once-in-a-generation crisis. So, as you can imagine, when reviews started rolling in yesterday, they weren't too positive. One Republican Senator said: "There are 100 problems with the plan." Another Republican: "It is a mess. I can't figure out what this bill is about." Another Republican of this Chamber said: "You look at the package that was rolled out by the Republican leadership, and it contains virtually nothing that will actually aid in the recovery." Those would be harsh criticisms if they came from Democrats, but those quotes weren't from Democrats; those were Republican Senators talking about their own party's plan.

Two senior Republican Senators have said that the Republican proposal would be lucky to get even half of the Republican conference to vote for it. Leader MCCONNELL warned Democrats against blocking the Republican proposal. It turns out that Senate Repub-

licans are blocking the Republican proposal.

So it is abundantly clear that the Senate Republican proposal for the next phase of COVID relief is not a useful starting point. You don't have to take my word for it; just ask President Trump, who took the podium yesterday afternoon and called the Senate Republican proposal "semi-irrelevant." At this point, I am beginning to wonder who does support the Republican proposal on COVID-19.

So here is where we are. We need to turn the page on the Republican proposal—and quickly. The legislative train wreck by Senate Republicans cannot derail our efforts to provide urgent, comprehensive, and necessary relief to the American people.

Speaker PELOSI and I have started negotiating with Chief of Staff Meadows and Secretary Mnuchin. We want to work with our Republican colleagues and the White House on a bill that actually meets the needs of the American people in these unprecedented times, but it is going to take good faith and compromise. We are not hearing that from Leader MCCONNELL.

Leader MCCONNELL is already drawing lines in the sand, insisting that any agreements include his specific corporate immunity provision—no negotiation. Put this provision—extreme provision—in the bill without negotiation. That sure doesn't sound like someone who wants to reach a bipartisan agreement. We are going to need everyone to pull together. We are going to need to focus on the needs of the American people.

With all due respect to the Republican leader, Americans on the brink of eviction are not crying out for a sweeping corporate liability shield. No one should be willing to torpedo all the relief Americans are counting on unless there is a giant corporate giveaway attached.

Time is short. Speaker PELOSI and I will be back at the negotiating table with the White House later today. It is time for our Republican colleagues to roll up their sleeves and get serious as well.

One final point on this subject. Again this morning, the Republican leader continued his "Alice in Wonderland" interpretation of what has happened. When what has happened is black, he says white. When what has happened is white, he says black. He is totally the opposite of the truth on what has happened.

He has suggested that Democrats might be trying to block progress on COVID relief because it might suit our party in the election, that we Democrats had decided to stop legislating until November—I mean, shocking stuff.

Over 10 weeks ago, Democrats—Democrats—passed a bill three times the size of the Republican proposal that was more generous and beneficial to the American people on nearly every measure. Leader MCCONNELL dismissed

it. Senate Democrats spent the entire month of June asking our Republican colleagues, including Leader MCCONNELL, to pass crucial legislation related to jobs, healthcare, and small business. We went on the floor and made those requests. Republicans blocked every single one—nearly every single one of those requests. So this absurd, nasty insinuation by the Republican leader doesn't pass the laugh test.

The fact that Leader MCCONNELL would even consider the idea that a political party might deny support for the American people in order to help win an election says more about the Republican leader than anybody else.

NLRB NOMINATIONS

On another matter, today the Senate will vote on two nominations to the NLRB—the National Labor Relations Board—one nominee from the Republican side and another from the Democratic side. On bipartisan boards and commissions like the NLRB, this used to be the tradition. The President's party always enjoys a majority on these boards, but it is crucial for the opposite party, whoever it is at the time, to have their recommendations approved to these bipartisan boards.

Unfortunately, the vote comes today after more than 2 years during which the Republican majority refused to even schedule a vote on a Democratic nominee to the NLRB, Mark Pearce. The Republicans waited so long that both Democratic nominees who were already on the NLRB had their terms expire.

While Democrats look forward to confirming Lauren McGarity McFerran to the NLRB later today, we are still frustrated that the Republican majority denied any Democratic representation on the Board for too long, and they continue to deny a vote on the second Democratic seat.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I intend to talk about section 230 here in just a moment. I just want to react to what the Democratic leader said and also make some observations generally about where I think we are with respect to a coronavirus relief bill.

The Democratic leader indicated that the Republican bill wasn't a serious bill. Frankly, I think it could be argued that the bill he has endorsed, passed by the House of Representatives, was not a serious bill. It was about \$3.5 trillion, which would make it about \$1 trillion larger than the massive coronavirus relief bill we passed unanimously in the Senate back in March. That bill, at the time, for a lot of people, represented something unlike anything they had ever seen before, both in terms of scale and scope, the expanse of all the issues that it addressed. I think in many respects it was a bill that most Members believed at the time that we needed to get as much assistance out there as quickly

as we could, and as a consequence of that, there was broad support for that.

We are at a different point now, obviously, several months later, and have some perspective that enables us to look at what might be effective, what has worked, and what hasn't worked. We have gotten a lot of input from State and community leaders, from businesses, schools, hospitals, and healthcare providers who have been impacted by the virus, and have been able to respond to what has already been done by the Congress in terms of assistance.

So I think at this point, as we look at what the greatest needs are, it is pretty clear that we have to do something to provide safety net assistance for those who have lost jobs in the form of unemployment insurance. I think there is a commitment on both sides to address that.

I would argue that the proposal advanced by the Democrats, which would just be a continuation of the existing program, is not one that I think most people across this country think is wise policy, and certainly to the degree that it provides an incentive for people to stay home and not go back to work, it does provide a disincentive to work.

I think that is something this legislation ought to address, and that is pretty much a widely held view, not just by Republicans but by Democrats. There are Democrats here in the Senate, Democrats in the House, and Democratic Governors who have said that the existing unemployment benefit needs to be modified, needs to be reformed, needs to be revised.

The question has been raised: What level? It strikes me, at least, that we ought not be putting a benefit out there that exceeds the amount that people would make if they were actually working, because what that essentially says is that those who are working, those who stayed in the workforce are basically paying benefits to those who did not, when, in fact, if there weren't a benefit that exceeded the amount that they made when they were working, they might get back in the workforce if those jobs become available again. That is certainly something we want to incentivize.

So I would hope that in any deal that is struck where we address unemployment insurance, we can come up with a solution that does tailor it to the need of the moment, and that is to get people back to work. We want to have policies that create jobs. That is something I think ought to be first and foremost in this bill.

We have indicated that this ought to be about kids, getting them back to school in the fall. It ought to be about healthcare, about coming up with therapeutics and more testing, better testing. It ought to be about ultimately, hopefully, getting a vaccine and in the meantime making sure that we are addressing the needs of our providers, those doctors and nurses and nursing home caregivers who are on the frontlines.

So those are the priorities that I think ought to be in this bill. It seems to me there is plenty of room for bipartisan cooperation, and it will take that. It also strikes me that this suggestion that you have to do more dollar-wise isn't always necessarily a sound approach. In fact, I would argue that anything we do right now ought to be targeted. It ought to be focused on those who have needs. If it is assistance to State and local governments, if it is assistance to small businesses that are out there creating jobs—anything that we do at this point ought to be based and predicated upon where the needs are, and we ought to have accountability for the funds that are going out there.

My impression from the bill passed by the House Democrats and supported by many Senate Democrats here is that the more we spend, the better it is. I don't think the American people subscribe to that view. I think they realize, like I do, that we are operating in an environment where we have a \$26 trillion debt, and we have already added this year, because of the first coronavirus bill, about another \$3 trillion to that debt and increased our debt to GDP ratio up over 100 percent, which is pretty dangerous territory if you look at any relevant metric in history.

So I would argue that the approach that we take right now ought to be focused, it ought to be targeted, it ought to be measured, and it ought to be directed to those who really have needs—by that, I mean people who are unemployed—through unemployment insurance. It ought to be small businesses that are trying to keep their employees employed and trying to get back and going again and creating jobs. It ought to be healthcare providers who are dealing with the frontline crisis and also the heavy investment we need to make in the ultimate solution, which will be the vaccine, and, of course, in terms of the fall, getting kids back to school. That entails a whole lot more testing. Those are all things that are included in the bill that was put forward by Republicans.

Most of the Democratic objections to that bill are that it doesn't spend enough, that it is just not generous enough. Well, again, I think we have to be very, very careful, very thoughtful and aware and conscience of the fact that we are operating at a time when we have \$26 trillion in debt, where every dollar we spend is a borrowed dollar, and we need to be effective, surgical, targeted, and wise about how we spend the American people's hard-earned tax dollars.

I am hopeful these discussions will lead to a solution. We knew right away that there wasn't going to be unanimous support for this. It is not like the last time around, and I have said all along that I wouldn't expect every Republican to support the bill that came out and was released a couple of days ago. I think it is a starting point.

I hope the Democrats will negotiate in good faith and not simply try to raise the ante because they have a bill that has already passed the House at \$3.5 trillion. That, to me—not to mention the size of it but also the components of it—was a very irresponsible bill. That is not a serious bill. And the fact that it mentions the word “cannabis” more times than it mentions the word “jobs” I think gives you all you need to know about how serious that effort was.

But there is a place that we can land that addresses those critical elements that I mentioned, and I hope that, notwithstanding the rhetoric we are hearing from the Democratic leader, the Democrats will enter into good-faith discussions and play a constructive role in trying to come up with a bipartisan solution to the challenges we face because of an unprecedented and historic pandemic.

PACT ACT AND SECTION 230

Madam President, yesterday in my role as head of the Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet, I led a hearing looking at proposed reforms of section 230 of the Communications Decency Act.

So what is section 230? Section 230 provides internet sites that host user-generated content—sites like YouTube or Twitter or Facebook—with immunity for the content users post on their sites. So, for example, if somebody uploads a YouTube video with defamatory content, YouTube isn't held responsible for that content.

It is not fair to say that section 230 has enabled the internet as we know it. Without section 230 protections, many of the sites we rely on for social connection or news or entertainment would never have come into being. If a solo blogger, for example, could be held responsible for monitoring each and every comment on his or her site, no matter how many hundreds or thousands there are, it is unlikely blogging would ever have taken off. If YouTube were responsible for the content of every one of the millions of videos on its site, it is unlikely that YouTube would have grown the way that it has.

There is a reason that user-generated sites like Twitter and Facebook are U.S. companies and not, for example, European companies. That is because other countries do not offer the liability protections of section 230.

But section 230 was written in the infancy of the internet, long before sites like Twitter and Facebook were created. As we have seen the internet grow, we have come to realize that there are also some changes that need to be made.

For example, while I support the principle that sites should not be held responsible for everything users generate, there is a difference between an inappropriate video a site misses and a site that knowingly allows itself to be used for criminal purposes.

In 2018, after it became obvious that certain sites were knowingly allowing

themselves to be used by child traffickers and predators, Congress passed a law to hold these and other sites responsible for enabling child sex trafficking.

As the previous chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee and current chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet, I have been focusing on internet issues related to user-generated content sites for the past couple of years. I have chaired several hearings on the topic, including a hearing on terrorist content on sites like Twitter and Facebook and a hearing on the opaque algorithms that these sites use to filter the content that users see.

At the end of June, Senator SCHATZ and I introduced legislation, the Platform Accountability and Consumer Transparency Act, or the PACT Act, to address some of the issues surrounding section 230 and user-generated content sites.

Our bill would preserve the benefits of section 230, like the internet growth and widespread dissemination of free speech it has enabled, while increasing accountability and consumer transparency. One reason section 230 has become so controversial is that internet platforms have cultivated the notion that they are merely providing the technology for people to communicate and share their thoughts and ideas.

But the reality is somewhat different. The truth is that websites have a strong incentive to exercise control over the content each of us sees, because if they can present us with content that will keep us engaged, we will stay on that site longer. Today, sites like Facebook and Twitter make use of sophisticated content moderation tool, algorithms, and recommendation engines to shape the content we see on these platforms.

Moderation can certainly improve the user experience. Most of us would prefer that YouTube suggest videos that match our interest rather than something completely unrelated. The problem is that content moderation has been and largely continues to be a black box, with consumers having little or no idea how the information they see has been shaped by the sites they are visiting. The PACT Act would address this problem by increasing transparency around the content moderation process.

It would require internet platforms like Facebook and Twitter to submit quarterly reports to the Federal Trade Commission outlining the material they have removed from their sites or chosen to deemphasize—for example, posts they have chosen to mostly exclude from users' feeds.

Sites would also be required to provide an easily digestible disclosure of their content moderation practices for users and, importantly, they would be required to explain their decisions to remove material to consumers. Until relatively recently, sites like Facebook

and Twitter would remove a user's post without explanation and without an appeals process. Even as platforms start to shape up their act with regard to transparency and due process, it is still hard for users to get good information about how content is moderated.

Under the PACT Act, if a site chooses to remove your post, it has to tell you why it decided to remove your post and explain how your post violated the site's terms of use. The PACT Act would also require sites to create an appeals process, so that if Facebook removes one of your posts, it would not only have to tell you why, but it would have to tell you a way to appeal that decision. To some extent, some platforms like Facebook are already starting to do this, but by no means are they all doing so.

The PACT Act would preserve companies' 230 protections for material posted on their sites, but it would require companies to remove material that has been adjudicated as illegal by a court. Large sites like Facebook and Twitter would be required to remove illegal content within 24 hours, while smaller sites would be given additional time. Failure to remove illegal material would result in the site's losing its 230 protections for that content or activity, a provision that matches a recent recommendation made by the Department of Justice for section 230 reform.

Finally, in addition to promoting transparency and accountability, the PACT Act also contains measures to strengthen the government's ability to protect consumers. As the Department of Justice has noted in its recommendations to reform section 230, broad section 230 immunity can pose challenges for Federal agencies in civil enforcement matters.

It is questionable whether section 230 was intended to allow companies to invoke section 230 immunity against the Federal Government acting to protect American consumers in the civil enforcement context. This contributes to the creation of a different set of rules for enforcing consumer protections against online companies, compared to those in the offline world.

I am grateful to Senator SCHATZ for his work on this bill, and I am proud of what we put together. We both have done a lot of work on these issues, and this bill is a serious bipartisan solution to some of the problems that have arisen around section 230. Our hearing yesterday, which included one of the original authors of the section 230 provision, former Representative Chris Cox, confirmed that the PACT Act would go a long way toward making our user-generated internet sites more accountable to consumers.

I look forward to working with Senator SCHATZ to advance our legislation in the Senate, and I hope that we will see a vote on our bill in the near future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, to date, America has lost nearly 150,000 people who have died with diseases related to coronavirus. We are quickly approaching 5 million cases of infections in the United States of America.

Consider this for a moment. The United States has 5 percent of the world's population. Yet we have almost 25 percent of all the COVID infections in the world. How did we reach this point that we have such a rampant rate of infection in what is considered one of the most developed nations on Earth?

Part of the problem is the President, who peddles worthless medical advice, and part of the problem is that the Republican Senate has been unwilling to face the economic hardships which have been created by this pandemic on our economy.

It was 10½ weeks ago that the House of Representatives, under Democratic control of Speaker PELOSI, passed the Heroes Act. That was 10½ weeks ago. They knew this day was coming—when the unemployment benefits that we put in the original legislation would expire, as they will this week, and the help for those who are renting to meet their obligations would expire, as it did last week. So 10½ weeks ago, Speaker PELOSI put on the table her proposal to deal with America after these things occurred.

Today, on the floor of the Senate, Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, called her efforts “a looney ideological fantasy”—“a looney ideological fantasy.” The obvious question to Senator MCCONNELL, who is the leader of the majority here in the U.S. Senate, is, Where have you been for the last 10½ weeks? Where is the Republican alternative, the Republican substitute? Why have we not seen that come forward and a real negotiation take place between the House and the Senate?

For the longest time, Senator MCCONNELL told us that he just did not feel “a sense of urgency” to take up this matter. He did not feel a sense of urgency. Well, history was made in the Senate Chamber this last Monday, because Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor and used the word “urgent.” Finally, urgency is stirring in his loins, and he announced this week a Republican alternative—but not quite. What he announced was a series of bills to be introduced by the Republican side—a series of bills. We are just days away from the situation where these issues are expiring, such as unemployment assistance, and yet, in this circumstance, we are dealing with the problem where we do not have alternatives from the Republican side. Well, we have some. One was addressed this morning, when it came to unemployment assistance.

Understand what happened last March 26 when we passed the CARES Act. This bill passed 96 to nothing in the Senate Chamber—unanimous, bipartisan. But when we sat down to establish the amount of money to be

given to unemployed workers in America, we ran into a problem—one we didn't anticipate. The Secretary of Labor in the Trump administration, Secretary Scalia, came to us and sat down at the table and said: You have a lot of interesting formulas when it comes to unemployment compensation, but just remember the reality. The reality is that 50 different States have 50 different computer systems, some of which are very modern and up to speed and others which are ancient and not up to speed. When you start coming up with complex Federal formulas for sending money to unemployed workers in these States, you are going to run into 50 different reactions. And that is exactly what we faced.

So the alternative was simple. We either gave a flat-dollar amount in the unemployment benefit supplement or we just wondered what the States might do with any other formula. So the decision was made—with the White House, with the Republicans—for the \$600 a week Federal supplement to unemployment. There was argument on the floor that some workers may come out ahead if that happens. Well, undoubtedly that might be the case, because the Federal supplement was in addition to whatever a person qualified for in State unemployment, and each State has a different formula for State unemployment assistance, and each worker has a different work experience and salary experience. But we went forward, believing we needed to do something dramatic and significant for the economy and the first place to start was with unemployed workers. Economists will state that when you are facing a recession, when there is a lack of consumer demand, the first dollar you want to hand out as a government is to an unemployed worker. You know they are going to spend it. They have to spend it to pay the rent or the mortgage, to pay the utility bills, to put food on the table, clothes on the kids, and to pay for health insurance. So we put money into the economy, and it worked. We managed to slow the decline of the economy, even though we see more unemployment still coming around. It would have been much worse if we hadn't made this commitment and invested in unemployment benefits.

So now, with the expiration of this Federal unemployment benefit program on July 31, just a few days away, the question is, What will we replace it with?

Democrats proposed in the Heroes Act in the House that we extend the current program to the end of this year. That is certainly a direct way to deal with this and one that would provide continuing assistance to these families.

The Republicans have come up with a much different approach. What they suggested is that we take the \$600-a-week Federal supplement and reduce it to \$200 a week, and then by October 1, we require the States to implement a

program that would give the unemployed workers 70 percent of their last wage. They obviously ignored what Secretary Scalia told us just a few months ago, and that is that the States would run into a terrible challenge trying to meet this new Republican standard of 70 percent of your last paycheck. We were told we couldn't do that back in March.

Has the landscape changed so much when it comes to State computer systems? I doubt it. I doubt it very much. In Illinois we have a good system, but it has been dramatically overwhelmed by the Federal supplemental payment and the new pandemic unemployment insurance and other provisions that we passed in Washington. So to think that we could move to a new formula in Illinois while meeting our current obligations is very difficult in our State, which is more modern than some.

Having said that, though, Republicans have argued that if by October 1 you can't provide 70 percent by formula to the unemployed workers, I suppose they will go back to the \$200 a week.

So what is behind this? What is at the heart of this? Well, there are several things that I think need to be noted on the floor. Here is the assumption. Listen to this. You have heard it over and over, and we heard it again this morning—the assumption that has been made by the Republicans in their approach to unemployment insurance.

They assume that if people are receiving \$600 a week in a Federal supplement to unemployment, that they are going to refuse to go back to work, even when offered a job. They are making more money to stay home than they did on the job; at least, that is what has been repeated over and over again.

This morning, I would like to put in the RECORD an article from the Yale News. This Yale study, which was just released this week, says: The Yale study finds expanded jobless benefits did not reduce employment. This is exactly the opposite of what we have heard over and over again from the Republican side.

This report from Yale economists said as follows:

[It found] that workers receiving larger increases in unemployment benefits experienced very similar gains in employment by early May relative to workers with less-generous benefit increases. People with more generously expanded benefits also resumed working at a similar or slightly quicker rate than others did, according to the report.

The data do not show a relationship between benefit generosity and employment paths after the CARES Act, which could be due to the collapse of labor demand during the COVID-19 crisis.

Put in simple terms, there aren't that many jobs out there looking for workers, and as it turns out, some unemployed workers have gone back to work, even though they might make slightly less than they did under unemployment. Why? The reason is obvious. Unemployment is a temporary benefit. Unemployment may not be as good and

generous as what a person has in the workplace when you count the benefits that come with some jobs. Ultimately, many workers who are unemployed today want to get back to work.

We should not assume, as some politicians do, that if a person is unemployed, they must be lazy. With 30 million unemployed Americans, that is hardly the case, and certainly when it comes to whether or not people have the incentive to go back to work, I believe most Americans do want to work. The notion that we have to change the whole system for fear that some might not is definitely unfair.

Let me just say this, as we move forward with this. I see a colleague on the floor seeking recognition in a few minutes. As we move forward with this attempt to deal with the economy, we have to face the reality, and the reality is, as made clear by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, that if we take our foot off the accelerator right now, we are going to plunge it over the cliff in a deeper economic mess than we are in today.

They are trying, by every means in monetary policy and the interest rates, to enliven this economy and create an environment where it may reopen soon. I hope that happens. But if we take the Republican approach, a little bit of this and a little bit of that, it is not going to work. We are going to find ourselves with a recession that is even worse.

And for those deficit hawks, how badly do you think our deficit will look if we face an even deeper recession? It is going to get worse and dramatically so. Shouldn't our first obligation be to the workers across America who have lost their jobs so they can keep their families together? This notion of cutting the Federal benefit from \$600 a week to \$200 a week, I can guarantee you, will mean much more traffic and activity at the food pantries around America as these unemployed families try to keep things together.

Then there is a proposal from the Republican side for a three-martini lunch Federal tax break. A three-martini lunch—is that the way out of our economic morass? And at the same time they are encouraging the three-martini lunch Federal tax break, they will not give any additional assistance to those who are receiving SNAP benefits—those low-income Americans who are needing some help just to feed their families. It seems that things are upside down.

The last point I will make is this. Senator MCCONNELL has said repeatedly for months: Nothing is going to happen in the Senate—nothing—to help anybody in America, unless he gets his wish to give immunity to American corporations from coronavirus lawsuits.

Finally, we get to see his proposal. It was released this week. I want to tell you, it is the most dramatic tort reform proposal I have seen since I have served in the U.S. Senate. It basically takes away the rights of workers, as

well as those who are customers of businesses, from recovering under a coronavirus lawsuit. It lowers the standard of care that is required of businesses to a level which basically will not protect Americans who face this pandemic across the country. At the same time, it is providing assistance and relief, it is, unfortunately, creating an environment where some businesses—some, unfortunately—will not be as careful as they should be in the way they conduct their businesses with customers and their employees. We know that we face a challenge here with this pandemic, but giving this kind of corporate break when it comes to immunity and liability only will make things more dangerous for customers and employees across the United States of America.

Let me say a word about what has been said on the floor over and over again by Senator CORNYN and Senator MCCONNELL—the so-called tsunami of lawsuits, the epidemic of frivolous lawsuits, the trial lawyers on parade to the courthouse because of this pandemic. Well, we have checked every lawsuit filed in the United States this year that mentions the word “coronavirus” or “COVID-19.” Do you know how many COVID medical malpractice cases have been filed so far this calendar year with this so-called tsunami of lawsuits? Six. Six. And how many consumer personal injury cases have been filed this year mentioning “COVID-19” or “coronavirus,” this epidemic, this flood of lawsuits? There are 15 across the entire United States of America. It is an imaginary problem that they are creating at this point. We can deal with it, and 28 States have already by changing their State laws, but giving immunity to corporations from coronavirus lawsuits will not make us safer, will not make the workplace safer for workers, or the business safer for customers.

If we are going to restore consumer confidence, everybody has to pull together. We ought to have standards established by the CDC based on public health and not politics. And businesses—conscientious businesses, I am sure, will follow those standards because they do care. Currently, we don't have these standards, and this effort will make it even less likely that we will.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Yale News article dated July 27, 2020 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the YaleNews, July 27, 2020]
YALE STUDY FINDS EXPANDED JOBLESS
BENEFITS DID NOT REDUCE EMPLOYMENT
(By Mike Cummings)

A new report by Yale economists finds no evidence that the enhanced jobless benefits Congress authorized in March in response to the COVID-19 pandemic reduced employment.

The report (PDF) ([https://tobin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/C-19%](https://tobin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/C-19%20Articles/) 20Articles/

CARES-UI identification vF(1).pdf) addresses concerns that the more generous unemployment benefits, which provide \$600 per week above state unemployment insurance payments, would disincentivize work.

The researchers assessed this claim using weekly data from Homebase (<https://joinhomebase.com/>), a company that provides scheduling and timesheet software to small businesses throughout the United States. The findings suggest that, in the aggregate, the expanded benefits neither encouraged layoffs during the pandemic's onset nor deterred people from returning to work once businesses began reopening.

The enhanced unemployment benefits were initiated under the CARES Act, a \$2.2 trillion economic stimulus package enacted on March 27 that attempted to ease the pandemic's severe economic consequences. The expanded benefits, which are set to expire July 31, provide a \$600 weekly payment in addition to any state unemployment insurance. The supplemental payment was designed to cover 100% of the average U.S. wage when combined with existing unemployment benefits. The generosity of an individual's unemployment benefits depends on several factors, including their earnings history and their state's schedule of benefits.

The report found that workers receiving larger increases in unemployment benefits experienced very similar gains in employment by early May relative to workers with less-generous benefit increases. People with more generously expanded benefits also resumed working at a similar or slightly quicker rate than others did, according to the report.

“The data do not show a relationship between benefit generosity and employment paths after the CARES Act, which could be due to the collapse of labor demand during the COVID-19 crisis,” said Joseph Altonji (<https://economics.yale.edu/people/faculty/joseph-altonji>), the Thomas DeWitt Cuyler Professor of Economics in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and a co-author of the report.

Critics argued that the expanded benefits, which exceeded many people's normal weekly wages, would incentivize businesses to lay off workers to cut costs and disincentivize recipients from returning to work. If the enhanced benefits had these effects, the researchers said, the data should show a significant drop in employment in the week after the CARES Act took effect; it should also show subsequent decreases in relative employment as workers with more generous unemployment benefits put off returning to work. The data did not yield results that support these predictions.

The researchers found no evidence that recipients of more generous benefits were less likely to return to work. They also found that workers who received larger increases in their unemployment benefits relative to their wages did not experience greater declines in employment after the CARES Act was enacted.

The Homebase data primarily covers small businesses that require time clocks for day-to-day operations. The majority are restaurants, bars, or retail operations. The workers represented in the dataset are hourly employees who earn relatively low wages. While the data does not represent the entire U.S. labor market, it captures a segment of it that has been disproportionately affected by the pandemic, the researchers noted.

The analysis controlled for the severity of the COVID-19 pandemic and for the various restrictions that states imposed on businesses during the public health crisis. The researchers tested their results against employment outcomes in the federal government's Current Population Survey, a more

representative sample of the labor market than the Homebase data, and obtained similar findings. But they stress that their results pertain to the current pandemic period of slack labor demand and do not speak directly to the effects of unemployment benefits on employment during normal times.

The report's other authors are Zara Contractor, Lucas Finamor, and Dana Scott (primary author), Ph.D. candidates in the Department of Economics; Ryan Haygood, a rising senior in Yale College and research assistant at the Tobin Center; Ilse Lindenlaub, assistant professor of economics; Costas Meghir (<https://economics.yale.edu/people/faculty/costas-meghir>), the Douglas A. Warner III Professor of Economics; Cormac O'Dea (<https://economics.yale.edu/people/faculty/cormac-odea>), assistant professor of economics; Liana Wang '20 B.A., an undergraduate research assistant; and Ebonya Washington (<https://economics.yale.edu/people/faculty/ebonyawashington>), the Samuel C. Park Jr. Professor of Economics.

The analysis, supported by Yale's Tobin Center for Economic Policy, comes as Congress debates whether to extend the expanded unemployment benefits. The full report is available on the Tobin Center's website ([https://tobin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/C-19%20Articles/CARES-UI identification—vF\(1\).pdf](https://tobin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/C-19%20Articles/CARES-UI%20identification-vF(1).pdf)).

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this morning to cover a couple of topics. One is on some comments on the legislation that I hope we are going to complete to provide relief to the Nation with regard to both the public health crisis and the jobs crisis, and then I will have two other sets of remarks in different parts of the RECORD, but let me start with what we are facing right now.

We know that it has been 4 months since the CARES Act, way back at the end of March, and we all expected, I think at that time, that that piece of legislation and the legislation prior thereto and subsequently would have an impact on Americans, we hoped, in a positive way. I think there is some evidence to indicate that the CARES Act had a positive impact. Obviously, it was not perfect legislation, but I don't think any of us thought that was the end of the road.

And then we saw, just 10 weeks ago, the Heroes Act pass the House of Representatives. So you have the CARES Act enacted into law and operative—and thank goodness for that—as well as several other pieces of legislation. But the Heroes Act only passed by the House and no action by the Senate in those intervening 10 weeks.

If you were on the majority side of the aisle, the Republican side, as Leader MCCONNELL has outlined, and you wanted to delay—wait to see the full impact of the CARES Act—there is an argument that some would make in that direction. I don't agree with it. But what I don't understand is why, even if you believe that you should wait, why would you not be preparing for the worst? Why would you not be preparing for the kind of outbreaks we have seen across the country when the

virus moved away from the Northeast, generally, to the South and Southwest, and then to the West even more so? Why would you not prepare at least an outline of legislation? Why would you not begin negotiations many, many weeks ago, as opposed to waiting until the last minute not just to respond to the overall problem—the worst public health challenge in a century—but also, in a particular way, why would you wait, as the majority did, until the very last minute on the issue of unemployment insurance when we know benefits are running out in a matter of hours, really, not even a few days now? So if that is your perspective that we should have waited, why wouldn't you prepare for the worst so that when the worst was hitting, or something comparable to that, you would have legislation ready to go?

The majority chose to delay, and I think, in a real sense, seemed to adopt the President's kind of virus denial that if you just don't talk about it or if you try to change the subject or, in the case of the majority, if you don't legislate about it or prepare—just prepare to legislate about it, it will somehow recede into the background, and we don't have to worry about it. Well, that delay and that denial has proved to be, I think, misguided, and I think that is being charitable.

So we are faced with a number of challenges at the same time as we face a public health and jobs crisis. I will start with nursing homes and long-term care and the very related issue of home- and community-based services.

We know that in long-term care settings, most of those settings being nursing homes, the Nation has endured more than 59,000 deaths. That number may have hit 60,000, but we know that it is more than 59,000 deaths. So more than 40 percent of all the deaths in the United States of America, which is now about to reach 151,000, I think, from what we saw this morning—more than 40 percent of those are in long-term care settings and most of them in nursing homes. This isn't theoretical to people out there. This isn't theoretical to families across my home State of Pennsylvania or a lot of other States where, in many States, 60 percent or more of all the deaths were in long-term care settings. The deaths are, of course, residents of those nursing homes, in addition to workers.

So when you combine resident deaths and worker deaths, you get more than 59,000. We have to ask ourselves as Americans: Is that just going to be acceptable? Are we going to stand here 3 months from now or 4 months or 6 months from now and say: Wow, it is really tragic, all these deaths, and another 59,000 people died in long-term care settings, mostly nursing homes? Is that the America we want? Is that the America we are going to settle for?

And, oh, I know, I can hear the argument: Oh, you know, it is a terrible virus. It is. It is a virus that hits the very old in disproportionately higher

numbers, and if you happen to be an older citizen and you have all kinds of chronic conditions or other health issues that might compromise your immune system or otherwise, you are especially susceptible.

So some would argue: Well, this is just going to happen. But we know exactly how to get the numbers down—the case numbers down and the death numbers. Is it perfect? No. Can we get the 59,000 to zero? Of course not. No one would argue that. But the idea that the United States of America, in addition to not responding effectively to the onset of the virus itself—I am just talking about a subset or a part of the tragedy, and that is the tragedy in our nursing homes, both for residents and their families and for workers and their families.

We know exactly what works, and I have a bill that would substantially reduce the deaths and the cases. What is it? Well, first of all, it is important to know the number—3768. That is the bill. I hope that my bill will be included wholly, or in substantial fashion, in the next bill. S. 3768, what does it do? It allocates \$20 billion.

Now, we have heard numbers that this next piece of legislation might hit \$1 trillion or more, and I think that is likely. We should ask ourselves: Can't we set aside \$20 billion of that, a fraction of that trillion dollar-plus or more bill that we will pass, we hope? Can't we set aside a fraction of that for older citizens and their families and the workers who take care of them? These are Americans who fought our wars. They worked in our factories. They built the strongest middle class the world has ever seen over the course of the last 75 or so years. These are people who were inventors and innovators. These are people who made America what it is today. They are our fathers and our mothers, our grandmothers and grandfathers. They gave us life and love. The least we could do is make an American effort to get the death numbers down and the case numbers down. Anyone who says we can't do that is defeatist and I think invoking an anti-American spirit. We know how to do this.

What will the \$20 billion go for? It is simple but could be profound in its impact.

No. 1, we know that one practice in a nursing home that reduces the number of cases of people contracting the virus and the death number is cohorting. What does that mean? Separating—separating those with the virus in the nursing home from those who don't have it. Nursing homes that did that were successful in getting their numbers down. They did it early, way back in early March—maybe even earlier in some cases—and it worked. It has been implemented in a number of States. But that has a cost to it. You might have to build out, and you might have to retrofit.

You also need extra dollars for personal protective equipment. There

should be no question that in the United States of America, every nursing home has every piece of personal protective equipment it needs. PPE is lifesaving—lifesaving for the resident to be guarded from contracting the virus and essential for the workers as well.

What else do we need the money for? If you have a problem in a nursing home with an outbreak, we ought to be able to surge expertise from other settings. That nursing home might need more doctors in that crisis or that outbreak. It might need more nurses or certified nurses assistants or other personnel. We should have the dollars at the State level to serve those professions. We also need more money for testing in nursing homes—vitally important.

I think families across the country expect us to directly address this. Unfortunately, the Republican bill proposed the other day does not do that, does not invest, as my bill would.

Here is a headline from just this week, July 24, in the New York Times. I will not read the story, but the headline is "FEMA Sends Faulty Protective Gear to Nursing Homes Battling Virus"—faulty protective gear. We are months into this, and we have FEMA sending faulty protective gear. Here are the first lines of the story:

Expired surgical masks. Isolation gowns that resemble oversize trash bags. Extra-small gloves that are all but useless for the typical health worker's hands.

It goes on and on. I don't have time to read it all today. But that article and so many other documented reports indicate that these facilities don't have the protective gear they need.

The second issue is unemployment insurance. We are told that the majority, in their proposal, wants to cut the \$600 per week down to \$200. Do the math—cutting it by \$400 a week. This is at a time when we are told that since February, the United States has lost 15 million jobs. My recollection is that in the great recession of around a decade ago—between the fall of 2008 and sometime in the spring of 2009, roughly—about half a million jobs were lost. We have already lost, basically, double that—15 million jobs. We were told: Oh, don't worry. April is going to be a bad month, and May and June are going to be a lot better. That unemployment rate is just going to roll down from there.

I was hoping that would be the case, but in Pennsylvania, in April, 1 million were unemployed. What was May? Fortunately, it went down—849,000. I expected June in our State to be a lot lower than 849,000. Maybe it would go down by 100,000 or 150,000; I hoped even more. But, unfortunately, it went from 849,000 to about 821,000—821,000 people out of work in Pennsylvania in the month of June.

We still have a jobs crisis that will endure for a good while yet and, therefore, an unemployment crisis. The worst time to cut those benefits, those extra benefits, would be right now.

I know we have heard the argument that if you continue this, you are creating a disincentive to work. That is what we are told. According to the Washington Center for Equitable Growth, in a report this month—just a couple of days ago—they found: “Lack of opportunities to work, not a disincentive to work, are keeping unemployment elevated.” That is what they found. They documented more than that statement would entail, but that is what they found in their research. They also found 23 percent fewer job openings in July of 2020 versus July of 2019. So there were fewer job openings.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor said that there are almost four unemployed in the United States for every job opening.

The third issue, State and local funding: The Republican proposal has nothing to help States and local governments. We know that State and local governments have to balance their budgets, so extra dollars can come only from one source—the Federal Government. State and local governments have had to spend more to protect their citizens with the onset of the virus, the COVID-19 disease, and the impact of the virus and the pandemic blew a hole in their budgets.

So what is going to happen? A State, whether it is a red State or blue State or whatever the political conditions—they are all the same when it comes to revenue loss. Here is what is going to happen, as sure as night follows day: They are going to have to cut education. So I would say to school districts: Get ready for cuts because if your State cannot balance its budget, there are going to be education cuts.

There will be cuts to healthcare, probably Medicaid in most instances, and there will be other cuts. Public transit—we were on a call last night with transit advocates from around Pennsylvania, and our side is asking for more help for transit. But you can go down a long list, whether it is education or healthcare or even public safety itself at the local level.

So we should do a lot more. We should be replicating or at least approximating what the House did when they allocated \$875 billion for State and local governments combined.

How about the Supplement Nutrition and Assistance Program? The majority has refused over and over again—categorically refused—to increase SNAP by the percentage that our side has argued for. I know it is a little easy in Washington to talk about hunger and food insecurity as some kind of distant issue because those of us who serve in this Chamber are not food insecure. We don't have to suffer the pain of hunger that many families are suffering. Many suffered food insecurity long before the pandemic, but many others—even middle-class families or people trying to get to the middle class—are suffering from food insecurity because of the virus and the economic downturn. Families, we know, are literally choos-

ing between the food they need for their families or paying the mortgage, choosing between the food they need—groceries—versus paying for their kids' medications.

The last issue in this part of my remarks is on Medicaid. We know that the Senate did the right thing in the Families First legislation way back in early March when it increased the matching dollars for Medicaid by 6.2 percent. Those matching dollars are vital for States to be able to pay for Medicaid and to be able to balance their budgets. The House bill, the Heroes Act, passed 10 weeks ago, I believe, set forth another increase of a higher amount—14 percent—for those matching dollars. I think that makes a lot of sense, especially when people are losing their jobs every day.

We just read a story in the New York Times last week, I think it was. More than 5 million people in the country have lost their health insurance because they lost their jobs or for other reasons. So a lot of those folks who are out of luck when it comes to healthcare itself are turning to Medicaid. We should increase the matching rate to 14 percent.

The Republican proposal has no additional dollars for Medicaid. I guess we should not be surprised because the White House budget proposals in the last several years—and I think supported in large measure by the Republican majority here in the Senate—have not only not wanted to increase dollars for Medicaid, but, in fact, the White House has proposed cuts of several hundred billion dollars to Medicaid over a 10-year timeframe several years in a row. Republicans in the Senate have said very little, if anything, against those kinds of proposals.

Let me just move to a separate set of remarks.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. President, I have some remarks about U.S. Representative John Lewis, whose casket just left in a hearse from the grounds of the Capitol this morning. It was moving to see the number of people who would stand in line for a long period of time in 97- or 99-degree heat to pass by his casket.

There is so much we could say about John Lewis. It is difficult to summarize or encapsulate or not repeat ourselves, but I think in so many ways John Lewis was courage personified. Very, very few Americans—other than those who served in combat itself or in other instances—could say that they have put themselves on the line as he did with his courage in the face of hatred and in the face of brutal beatings and otherwise.

John Lewis helped the United States in its ongoing work to form a more perfect union. There is so much more we could say about that. He was beaten on multiple occasions for standing up for civil rights and, of course, the right to vote itself. He did all of this—all of this—by practicing nonviolence. I don't know how he did that. I really don't. I

would like to be able to think that I could do that in the face of beatings, but I don't think I could. I really doubt that I could and that most people could. But he practiced nonviolence and thereby had a huge impact on the American people and American law.

He served 33 years here in the U.S. House of Representatives. He also served on the Atlanta City Council. When President Obama was bestowing the Medal of Freedom on John Lewis, he said that John Lewis was “the conscience of the U.S. Congress.” It was so well said.

I think, at a time like this, we are summoned by his enduring example. We are summoned by his heroic example to pass the voting rights bill, H.R. 4, which has been basically sitting here since December, when the House passed it. That is the best way to demonstrate our gratitude for John Lewis's contributions.

The fight against injustice must continue. We can't just say what a great man he was or what a great leader he was; we have to continue to be inspired by and act against injustice whether it is in housing or food insecurity or education or employment or healthcare or otherwise.

Martin Luther King said one time, “Until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.” John Lewis's life was in furtherance of that goal—to bring about a world where justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

I think John Lewis was a patriot in the broadest sense of the word. We know from the song “America the Beautiful,” that wonderful line, “O beautiful for patriot dream that sees beyond the years,” that the dream of a patriot, when they are fighting on a battlefield, is not just about the fight they are in; the dream of a patriot, of course, is about what happens after, that their sacrifice brings about a better world, a more secure country in the context of a war or a battle.

John Lewis also had the dream of a patriot, the dream of a better life for Americans, the dream of equal protection under the law, the dream of voting rights being protected. In the largest sense of the word, John Lewis was a patriot.

I am almost done. I know I might be overtime, and I know we have a colleague waiting. I will be brief. I apologize for going a little long.

We know that there has been a lot of debate about what happened when we had reports in the New York Times and other reports, in June, about the U.S. intelligence community learning that Russian intelligence had offered payments as high as \$100,000, transferred through a middleman, to kill U.S. servicemembers in Afghanistan.

I know that we don't have time to get into all the details of that today, but we know that the President has, I think, on the record, not said anything about this until maybe yesterday in an

interview, and in my judgment, he did not address and did not respond appropriately to those reports.

I was hoping what the President would say in the interview that I saw on television this morning—I guess it was yesterday—and what he would have said long before that is that we are going to investigate this and we are going to make a determination about the conclusion that we reach—that he would reach as President and that he would directly confront Vladimir Putin and challenge him on this. But he had a recent phone call with him, and all the reporting indicates and even the President indicated in his interview that he did not challenge Vladimir Putin. That is beyond disturbing, and I think it is not in furtherance of our national security interests.

In the interest of time today, I will not say more because I know we are over time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHINA

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, it is interesting to hear my colleagues talk about China and COVID and our response. I think many of us looked at 2019 and felt like that was really a significant year for U.S.-China relations. It marked the 40th anniversary of bilateral diplomatic relations between Washington and Beijing, and we also finalized a phase 1 trade deal.

This led many of us to being optimistic, but remember that 2019 also marked the 70th anniversary of Chairman Mao's ascension to the chairmanship of the Chinese Communist Party and the 30th anniversary of the massacre at Tiananmen Square.

When you start asking questions about that history and how it has informed the decisions of current Chinese leadership, the capitalist facade that has been so carefully constructed by the propagandists in Beijing starts to peel away, and it starts to crack.

After decades of espionage, military aggression, and horrific political violence inflicted on their own people, many here in Washington have grown numb to Chinese hostility. They kind of expect or accept that is the way they are going to act. That is the only explanation I could come up with for the shock that rippled through this town when we discovered that the Chinese Communist Party spent 51 days muzzling the doctors, lawyers, and journalists who desperately tried to warn the rest of the world about the growing threat from the novel coronavirus.

Our relationship with China has reached a tipping point. We will never be able to go back to what had been that cautious optimism that we had in 2019.

Fortunately, it looks like both my colleagues here in Washington and many of our allies are allowing themselves to process the threat posed by Beijing's standard operating procedures. The UK has banned the use of equipment from Chinese tech giant Huawei for their ongoing 5G rollout, and France has implemented policies that restrict the use of Huawei's products. These decisions are giving some hope to the people I am talking to back in Tennessee every single day. They are happy to see that allies are following in our footsteps. This is a good thing. It is an opportunity for us to role-model how you work to unravel a relationship with an aggressor.

They would also want me to tell you that they appreciate the Senate's growing bipartisan support for legislation like my SAMC Act, which will secure our pharmaceutical supply chains from Chinese interference, and Senator MCSALLY's Civil Justice for Victims of COVID Act, which will allow Americans harmed by this pandemic to sue the Chinese Communist Party officials in U.S. court.

But we all know that there is no single-shot bill we can use to decouple from China and put control back in the hands of American businesses, educators, institutions, and innovators. We have to begin to unravel these ties with China. Now, there are a lot of people in this town who think that this is impossible, and they will say: Oh, that is ill-advised. You do not want to try to unravel from China.

I think they are wrong, and I think that we can and we must do this. But lipservice is not going to cut it. Over the past few months we have talked at length about what needs to be done, but, with few exceptions, we are light on specifics. So last Wednesday I published a white paper laying out the current state of affairs between the United States and China and talked about what got us to this position. Then, I have 120 specific policy recommendations that Congress can use as a basis for future legislation, whether it is trade or agriculture or telecommunications or 5G or our military complex. I would like to use my remaining time to lay out a few of these recommendations as a place to start.

By now most Americans are at least familiar with the term "Belt and Road Initiative." This is an initiative program the Chinese have used to buy their way. They have bought their way into the good graces of governments in Asia, Africa, and Europe. The trillions of dollars in investment buys inroads and influence across countries of every economic background and in organizations like the United Nations.

While we cannot and should not compete dollar for dollar, we should partner with our allies to prevent struggling governments from falling into this debt diplomacy or these debt traps. We must also secure our supply chains across every sector of our economy and bring critical manufacturing

and technologies back to the United States.

I mentioned the SAMC Act. It would incentivize companies to bring their manufacturing operations back to the United States and also fund partnerships between pharmaceutical companies and universities so that they can train the workforce we need in order to pull this manufacturing out of China and bring it back to communities right here.

We should not hesitate in moving forward on this legislation. Once we invest in this new technology and infrastructure, we are going to have to invest in securing it by securing our emerging 5G networks. To that end, we need to make more spectrum available for the commercial wireless sector to ensure our continued leadership in 5G and other emerging technologies. If we fail to do so, we risk ceding ground to China in the standard-setting bodies that are going to define 5G internationally.

We will not be able to stop China alone. We must look toward those international organizations, as well as allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific, to help us deter Chinese aggression and foster stable economic growth. This includes providing support for Hong Kong and Taiwan and promoting universal human rights standards, both in China and across the globe. We will also increase defense investment in the region through a newly created Pacific Deterrence Initiative.

Most importantly, we must accept the fact that, at its core, China is not a normal country. It does not behave like a normal country. When Xi Jinping ascended to the head of the Chinese Communist Party in 2012, many assumed he was going to act as a reformer and turn away from the Maoist thought, but, predictably, he did not.

We cannot simply wait for this problem to go away. Last week, Beijing escalated tensions by ordering Americans to vacate our only consulate in western China, distancing its abuses in Tibet and Xinjiang from American diplomatic personnel. You know what. It is not going to stop with this. They are accelerating their aggression.

We have to become more independent of China. We are too dependent on them at this point. It is time for the United States to deny this era of Chinese impunity and change the way we are doing business. It is time to reestablish rules to guide the global economy, to encourage our allies to join us, and to hold Beijing accountable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, if cloture is invoked on the Kan nomination, the confirmation vote occur at 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, July 30. I further ask that the cloture vote on the Kaplan nomination occur at 2:45 p.m. today and that,

if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate immediately vote on his confirmation. I further ask that the cloture vote on the McFerran nomination occur at 4:45 p.m. today and that, if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate immediately vote on her confirmation. Finally, I ask that, if any of these nominations are confirmed, that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Derek Kan, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, John Cornyn, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Lamar Alexander, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Marsha Blackburn, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, James E. Risch, Shelley Moore Capito, Michael B. Enzi, Mitt Romney, John Barrasso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Derek Kan, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 147 Ex.]

YEAS—76

Alexander	Cortez Masto	Hassan
Barrasso	Cotton	Hawley
Blackburn	Cramer	Hoey
Blunt	Crapo	Hyde-Smith
Boozman	Daines	Inhofe
Braun	Durbin	Johnson
Burr	Enzi	Jones
Capito	Ernst	Kaine
Carper	Feinstein	Kennedy
Casey	Fischer	King
Cassidy	Gardner	Klobuchar
Collins	Graham	Lankford
Coons	Grassley	Leahy
Cornyn	Harris	Lee

Loeffler	Risch	Sinema
Manchin	Roberts	Smith
McConnell	Romney	Sullivan
McSally	Rosen	Thune
Moran	Rounds	Tillis
Murkowski	Rubio	Toomey
Murphy	Sasse	Warner
Paul	Schatz	Whitehouse
Perdue	Scott (FL)	Wicker
Peters	Scott (SC)	Young
Portman	Shaheen	
Reed	Shelby	

NAYS—22

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Stabenow
Bennet	Heinrich	Tester
Blumenthal	Hirono	Udall
Booker	Menendez	Van Hollen
Brown	Merkley	Warren
Cantwell	Murray	Wyden
Cardin	Sanders	
Duckworth	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—2

Cruz	Markey
------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 76, the nays are 22.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Minnesota.

CORONAVIRUS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to address the impact that the coronavirus pandemic is having on rural America.

We know that it affects every area of this country. In the urban areas of our country, we have seen what this has meant to the people who are in crowded housing and to the people who work every day in our urban hospitals. We have seen it in the suburban areas with small businesses and with moms who are trying to figure out how to handle the summer with their kids, but the rural areas sometimes don't get as much attention. The Presiding Officer knows of this in his home State of Oklahoma. He understands this.

There are a lot of rural areas in our country that have suffered as well. They have suffered not only because of spikes in the virus, like we have seen recently, but also because of the economic implications—a farm economy that was already in trouble because of the price of commodities, because of world trade barriers, because of weather events. You name it. It has affected rural areas in a big, big way.

According to several recent reports, as of July 14, one-third of all rural counties are now considered red zones, places that in the last week of testing added 100 or more new cases per 100,000 people. Between June 13 and July 12, the number of new cases in rural counties increased by 150 percent. That is why we must take immediate action to provide the critical support that the rural areas need.

They are areas that may not have easy access to hospitals or that may have smaller hospitals. That is why the issue of funding for State and local governments, as long as we make sure the rural areas are able to share in this funding as well, is so important for the rural hospitals, for their equipment—all of this.

This is beyond what we all know already of the food supply chains and our nutrition programs. We certainly don't want a situation in which one can't get

homegrown American food. Just as we have learned with the medical equipment supply chain, we can't always get the swabs that we need for so much of our testing and the like.

I just want to make clear that people sometimes see rural areas as though they are out there, doing fine—all of these idyllic pictures. I don't think they understand the struggle, the fact that rural poverty for kids is often higher than it is in urban areas, and this was before the pandemic. To me, the pandemic has just put a big magnifying glass on some of these disparities that we knew already existed.

There is a more senior population in rural areas, so you have people trying to keep themselves safe. They are isolated in seniors' homes or in areas of smaller assisted living, where they are very, very isolated, even more so than they might be, but where they have their families nearby who can at least visit them through a window. That is even harder. So, really, all of these challenges conspire to make this a topic that we must discuss.

The operation of public hospitals, long-term care facilities, and first responder services during a public health crisis requires a significant mobilization of resources, and this relief package that I am pleased we are debating now—I would like to see more movement, but at least the negotiations are ongoing—must include the funding for rural area hospitals as well as for State and local governments. Local governments in rural areas are facing both falling revenues and increased emergency expenses. They have smaller margins under which they operate, which threatens their ability to provide essential public services and their ability to continue paying teachers and first responders.

The public health crisis is putting incredible pressure on our public health system, and many rural hospitals and health systems already have limited ICU beds and resources. The disproportionately low number of healthcare providers across rural America has been brought into sharp focus by this crisis. We have already heard stories of the hospitals that were once delivering babies but that lost one OB/GYN doctor and could no longer deliver babies. Then the family has to go miles and miles and hours and hours just to have the delivery of a baby in a safe situation. That is why we need to do much. It is the funding.

There is a bill that Senator GRASSLEY and I have that will actually allow some of the smaller hospitals—this was prepandemic—to exist in different circumstances, like emergency room circumstances, so they don't entirely close down. It is why I have led the reauthorization of the Conrad 30 Waiver Program, which has brought in over 15,000 immigrant doctors to fill the gaps. We also know there are issues of personnel in these hospitals—nurses and doctors. This is a program that allows for immigrant students who have

gotten degrees from American medical schools to be able to serve out their residencies in underserved areas in America, which sometimes means in urban areas that don't have enough personnel and which, lots of times, means in rural areas. That is why, in fact, the initial author of this bill was Senator Kent Conrad of North Dakota. It is because of the problem North Dakota had.

As I have traveled through the country in the last year, I have continued to hear about all of the problems we have in our VA hospitals and the like. They want to have these physicians who have been trained in America and have degrees from America to stay and not have to go back to their home countries when, in fact, they want to stay in America.

Helping rural hospitals also means ensuring they have vital protective equipment, like masks, gowns, and gloves; and medical supplies, like ventilators.

That is why I have urged the administration to deliver supplies from the Strategic National Stockpile and to protect consumers' access to medical and hygiene products.

It also means delivering additional resources for testing and for contact tracing, like the \$75 billion that the House passed in the Heroes Act, and it means expanding telehealth services, which my bill with Senators Casey and Capito—the ACCESS Act—would do.

I recently had the experience of my own dad, at age 92, with coronavirus. He ended up at age 92 surviving it, with just having lost 10 pounds and a very poor appetite, but he came out of it as strong as he went into it. But I didn't know that was going to happen, and I will never forget that moment of our family standing outside the window because, of course, we couldn't go in. We are standing out there en masse while he is in his room—or in a room that they had given him, because he got coronavirus—and they put the telephone on so that he can hear us on speaker phone, but he cannot figure out what is going on. He doesn't really understand, with his disease, why we are wearing the masks and we can't even hold his hand. And you don't know if that is the last time you are going to see your loved one at that moment. As it turned out, it had a happy ending for him, and he is doing fine, but not for everyone else that was in his home.

That is why these services, where maybe he could see us on a big TV, instead of maybe on the little iPhone when we do FaceTime, would make such a difference, not just to people in his situation who are in a small assisted living, with the need of services, but if people are there because they wanted to have a living situation where they could hang out with their friends and play bridge and the like. We are going to have to think of those senior facilities and the access we can give not only to doctors to consult

with patients, but also for them to be able to see their families.

This means broadband. That is why I introduced the Accessible, Affordable Internet for All Act—comprehensive broadband legislation led by Representative JIM CLYBURN of South Carolina. I was honored that he asked me to carry this bill in the Senate. It would invest \$100 billion to build high-speed broadband infrastructure in underserved areas. Underserved areas, a lot of times, as he knows from his State of South Carolina, include a lot of rural areas and rural farmers. In his case, there are so many African-American communities that are underserved by broadband, and it would make a big difference all over the country.

Senator CRAMER of North Dakota and I introduced the Keeping Critical Connections Act, which, again, is another way of focusing on low-income and on rural areas to help our small broadband providers who, in my experience, have tended to really put their money where their mouth is and actually build out in these areas so that people get high-speed broadband.

Our bill now has 34 cosponsors—half Democrats, half Republicans—and I keep working to ensure that students in low-income families, regardless of their ZIP Code, are connected.

I don't want to hear another story like I heard of the high school student who had to take her biology exam in the liquor store parking lot in town because she didn't have high-speed access; or the doctor who can, yes, see the x rays at his rural hospital, but if he wants to do work from home, as so many of us are doing in the pandemic, he has to go to the McDonald's parking lot to be able to view these x rays.

Iceland can do this. They have volcanoes. They are covered at times in ash, and they have been able to get high-speed internet to every person in their country. We should be able to do the same.

Farmers. I spent the morning on a number of Zoom calls with our farmers in Minnesota—our soybean farmers and others—and I have to say that they are in hard times right now. They are in hard times because, as I said, before this pandemic, we were having problems. Our food supply chain has been hit—from the farmers who grow our food, fuel, and fiber, to the workers in the processing plants, of which I have many in my State.

I was just in Worthington, MN, which is the home of one of the biggest food processing plants that was hit hard by the coronavirus. They have put in place some better safety measures, and they are now operating.

There are the truckdrivers and barge operators, who deliver products to stores and export terminals and the families who may be struggling to put food on the table due to sudden unemployment.

When many businesses began shutting down in March, commodity futures prices tumbled, given the lower

demand for food and fuel. At the beginning of the pandemic, dairy producers estimated that milk prices would drop by \$2.85 billion in 2020. Cattle ranchers and hog producers saw the value of their livestock drop by 30 to 40 percent, and the futures price for corn and soybean fell 10 to 15 percent per bushel.

These losses occurred as farmers were still recovering from weather conditions that delayed or prevented harvest last year. Many farmers were barely breaking even as it was, and they began this spring planting season behind, and then they confronted the pandemic.

In March, we passed the CARES Act. It was not perfect. We all know that, but it provided \$23.5 billion in disaster assistance for farmers and livestock producers impacted by the pandemic. The Department of Agriculture began making payments in June, and, as of yesterday, they had processed over \$6.5 billion in payments to more than 473,000 producers.

But there is still money that has been unspent. That is \$14 billion. In addition to funding for the next package, it must reach producers of all sizes. This has been particularly hard in my State, waiting for that help.

The House has already taken action to provide additional direct assistance for farmers and dairy and livestock producers. I met with Representative COLLIN PETERSON, who heads up the House Ag Committee, this weekend, when we were both here, marooned in Washington, and went through the work that he had done, and I am very hopeful that we can do something similar in our bill here.

While farmers and livestock producers need emergency relief, we also must recognize that the pandemic has placed a significant strain on workers and consumers. We cannot slow the spread of the coronavirus when tests can take as long as 12 days to provide results.

A friend back in Minnesota, just a week ago or so, got a test. He felt sick, didn't want to get his family infected, and spent 6 days in the basement not being able to see his family, and it took that long to find the result. And then he found out he didn't have it. Those stories are just as similar but, of course, much more fortunate—but similar to people who wait when they are sick, and they need to know if they are sick. And not everyone has a basement to stay in. So the point of this is that these delays in testing are very, very difficult on our economy.

That is why, in May, I joined Senator DEBBIE STABENOW, the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee and my Democratic colleague on the Senate Agriculture Committee, in introducing the Food Supply Protection Act. The bill would provide support for food banks to upgrade their infrastructure to handle additional demands, strengthen food partnerships to prevent food waste, and protect workers through grants—and here we get to

what I was talking about—for protective equipment, test kits, and cleaning supplies.

Also, last week, I joined Senator JERRY MORAN of Kansas in introducing the Requiring Assistance to Meat Processors for Upgrading Plants Act, or the RAMP-UP Act, that we are doing together.

The closure of meat packing plants highlighted the need to provide consumers with more choices and farmers with more flexibility when marketing their livestock.

Our bill would help small and medium-size meat packers make improvements to their facilities so they can meet the standards necessary for Federal inspections. This will allow them to make sales across State lines and increase market opportunities.

These two important pieces of legislation—the Stabenow bill I mentioned and the one that Senator MORAN and I just introduced—should be included in the next relief package.

Another critical component to the rural economy is our Nation's biofuel industry. In the first quarter of 2020, biofuel processing plants purchased an estimated 1.3 billion bushels of corn and supported over 350,000 jobs.

Many of them are based, of course, in rural communities. In fact, a lot of our farmers own the plants. In fact, a lot of our local people depend on these plants for one of the major businesses in their small towns.

Even before the pandemic, the misuse of small refinery exemptions under the renewable fuel standard by the EPA had led biofuel plants to shut down.

I will never forget visiting a biodiesel plant in Iowa that had been shut down, and there was one worker left. His job was to maintain the plant, and he took me on a tour of the empty plant and then pulled out a coat rack that contained the uniforms of the people—his friends—who used to work there. And embroidered on the uniforms were the names of the workers, with names like Bob, Joe, Salvador. A tear goes down his cheek, and he said: I kept these uniforms. I keep them pressed on this coat rack because I hope they will come back and work here.

That was before the pandemic, and that is what we have seen because of some policies by this administration that claim that they wanted to help the Midwest but instead granted wholesale a bunch of exemptions, not just to the refineries. It is in there for a good reason—to help struggling refineries—but they, literally, granted those exemptions to Exxon, to Chevron, to dozens and dozens and dozens of companies. And that is before the pandemic.

That is why Senator GRASSLEY and I have taken this on in a big way. These losses—this is, again, prepandemic—have resulted in over 100 biofuel processing plants nationwide idling production or closing altogether. It is combined, prepandemic and during the pandemic.

That is why in May I introduced legislation with Senator GRASSLEY to sup-

port biofuel producers during the pandemic. Our bill involves reimbursement for their feed stock or commodity purchases through the first quarter of this year.

It is also why I led a letter with 19 Senators urging the EPA to deny 52 petitions for waivers that would enable more billion-dollar oil companies to receive small refinery exemptions.

The approval of these retroactive exemptions at this moment would only worsen the unprecedented economic challenges facing the biofuel industry. Competition is good in America. That is why we have the renewable fuel standard, because it is a nascent new fuel, and it had to really get into that market in a big way against Big Oil, which gets many more subsidies than the biofuels do. And this is not a time to go backward and shut down every biofuel plant in America, and that is where this administration is headed, if it keeps up these practices.

There is much more we must do to help our rural communities. I would note that one of the emerging issues I have heard about a lot in my State is these childcare deserts, and that is that rural families are seeing unavailable childcare. This is, again, prepandemic. It was a big problem, where you would have so many people who wanted to work but were unable to get childcare to be able to do that work.

That is not just in my State. It is all over the country. That is why Senator SULLIVAN and I introduced the Child Care Workforce and Facilities Act prepandemic, which would address the national shortage of affordable, quality childcare in these rural areas to help them expand their childcare workforces.

Right now, the economy is slowly but surely starting to reopen, and we know that for families who have been at home and the parents are still working, this has become harder and harder for moms and dads to figure out what they are going to do about childcare.

So this should be a time where we step back and say: OK, how are we going to deal with this, not just with the threat moving from the pandemic now, today, but the day after tomorrow? And I mean that as a metaphor for next year. How are we going to make this work for rural areas?

And I have gone through everything I think we need to do to get there: the healthcare, making sure that we have healthcare available in rural areas; the broadband, making sure that something we can do is available; the childcare deserts; and the ag economy.

I will say that there is a big argument for rural America right now, as we have seen that people are able, with the right connections, to work from home, and we need new ideas and new startups, and it is actually less expensive to start new companies in the rural part of this country, where the cost of living is lower.

We know that there are farmers that want to keep farming their small plot

of land in places like South Carolina and in places like Oklahoma and in places like Minnesota. But if we just allow rampant consolidation in the ag industry and the tech industry—where there is a hearing going on, as I speak right now, over in the House that maybe a few more people are watching—the point of it is this: We have to also take on consolidation during this pandemic and look at our laws next year. And I am not just going to wait for a bunch of judges to make decisions when they have been going against the antitrust laws now at the Supreme Court level for years—one loss after another. It just so cries out for a change in our antitrust laws. We have adapted these laws over the years.

I will end with one story involving that. I was at a small cafe a few years ago in Albert Lea, MN. A woman was there with her former husband and her brother-in-law.

She turned to me and she said: “I just saw you on TV.”

I said: “Was it about Russia and the elections?”

The Presiding Officer and I were doing a lot of work at the time nationally on protecting our elections from foreign interference.

I said: “Was that it?”

She said: “No. That wasn't it.” She said that it was on the local station. It was about States. It was about how things are getting too big, and it makes it hard for us.

We want to maintain our rural spaces. It is not just a romantic vision of the past. We want to maintain our rural areas for America. It is about having food that is ours, having it made in America so we are not dependent on foreign foods. It is about having our own energy supply, which can be varied and vast. It is about having our own technology and developing the next new idea and the next new iPhone. We are not going to be able to do that if we shut out a big swath of our country. That is not going to work. We actually want to encourage development in rural America. That is what I think we need to do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, just 75 days ago today, the Democratic House passed the Heroes Act. The Heroes Act was a comprehensive and I think very bold bill that addressed the very real needs that face this country as we struggle to contain the coronavirus.

During the 75 days that passed, we Democrats pressed the Republican leadership to take up the Heroes Act in the Senate, and for 75 days, we have been told no. The point was simple:

Bring it up, vote for it or against it, amend it if you want, but let's have some real action.

For 75 days we have watched the virus spread. We saw the death toll rise as President Trump stood by, denying the severity of the crisis, attacking the science, and assuring the American public that the virus would just go away on its own. For 75 days we watched as critical deadlines bore down on us for programs that offered a lifeline to the American people, including the expiration of Federal unemployment benefits and a moratorium on evictions.

This week, on Monday, after 73 days of waiting, Senate Republicans finally unveiled their proposals to address the coronavirus pandemic, and even some Republicans have said it is disjointed and in disarray. One has to ask, what has been done all this time?

Instead of one bill, it is a collection of eight different pieces of legislation, introduced by eight different Members. Instead of a cohesive package to address the needs of the American people and to get the virus under control, their proposals prioritize corporations over people. They put business interests ahead of society.

It is unclear whether the White House has blessed this package. It is even less clear whether it has the support of the majority of Republicans in this body. One thing that is clear: The priorities are completely misplaced.

My friends on the other side of the aisle seem to think they can fix our Nation's problems by simply forcing a reopening of the economy, forcing people back into the workplace, and forcing children back to school as if the virus isn't still spreading like wildfire. It is a terrible approach and would make us less safe.

Everybody wants to get the economy on track. We want schools to reopen, and we want to return to the workplace. But the only way to accomplish that is to contain the virus, slow the spread. That is the only thing that will give people the confidence to emerge from their homes and reengage in society and our economy. To do that, there are certain things we have to do.

We have to have quick and efficient testing and contact tracing. We need a vaccine, but we will have to have a way to mass-produce that vaccine, once we have it, to the people. We need to support unemployed Americans until we get through this crisis. We need to keep people from being evicted and losing their homes. We need to create safe working environments and safe learning environments for our children. Where children must learn from home with parents working from home, we need to make investments in the infrastructure they need to be successful.

The Republican bill fails on all these points. It has insufficient funding for testing and contact tracing. It has insufficient funding for a mass-vaccine campaign once we have a vaccine. It underfunds education programs. It uses

the money as a stick to force school districts to open even if the locality and public health agencies say it is not safe. It fails to provide much needed investment in broadband and internet access for rural areas to allow for distance learning where it is needed.

One teacher said to me: If you force us to open, what happens when a week after it opens, two children and two teachers have COVID-19? The school closes down for a period of time. Let's be realistic.

There is no increase for SNAP benefits even though more people are going hungry today in America. There is no new funding for State and local governments that are laying off teachers and healthcare workers and first responders as revenues dry up.

The Republican proposal inexplicably cuts Federal unemployment benefits to millions of workers. They insist this incentivizes people to go back to work. Where are they going to work? Where are the jobs? People want to work, but jobs are hard to come by. All this does is make more people destitute, put people more at risk of not being able to put food on the table or pay the rent.

To show why this proposal is a non-starter, let me share a few stories from Vermonters who have written or called or come into my office as I have been around Vermont this past weekend.

One man wrote to me because he is concerned he will be evicted from his home in the next few days. He has been out of work since March, only able to survive because of the Federal unemployment benefits in the CARES Act, which in this bill have been callously stripped away. His wife is taking classes at the local community college in the hopes of one day getting a better job. In just a few short days, they could face eviction because they can't afford to make their \$750 rent payment. Instead of inching ever closer to achieving the American dream, that dream is being snatched away through no fault of their own. Homelessness is now a real possibility for them.

He writes:

I hope that you and your fellow Senators can find a solution as soon as possible, because we are all affected by what happens in the Capitol.

He is right. Whatever is done here affects him and his family and all other families. What are the solutions being proposed? Unemployment benefits slashed, no rental assistance, and the expiration of the eviction moratorium. When is the last time anyone in this room struggled to make rent? Who are we to tell this man he does not deserve continued help from his government in the middle of a pandemic?

Another voter contacted me over the fate of her 98-year-old mother. Since March, her mother and the other residents of her nursing home have been confined to their rooms, unable to join each other for dinner and unable to participate in activities. The nursing home staff lack the necessary personal protective equipment and testing capa-

bility. She has not been able to even hug her own mother since the pandemic started.

She writes:

We can't just have a single-state or single-country response to this pandemic. We must all work together to take action now to support the most vulnerable members of our society.

I couldn't agree more. We need to work together. We need to protect the most vulnerable among us. We need to prioritize the most urgent of needs, but the Republican proposal doesn't do that.

Across our country, children are going hungry because their parents are out of work and the cost of food is on the rise. The Republican proposal includes nothing for SNAP and nothing for child nutrition. But there are multibillion-dollar giveaways to the defense industry. Republicans say they want 5 years of immunity for large corporations so they will not be sued if they force their workers back to work if they get sick, but they have no money in there for the protection of those workers. They protect the owners of the company who probably don't even come in the company. They protect them but not the workers in the company.

They take money to replace money that the White House basically took away to build a wall that Mexico was supposed to pay. Then, when I saw this in the proposal, here was \$1.7 billion for an FBI building that was going to be built either in Virginia or Maryland—\$1.7 billion to protect the aging building and prop it up. Why? Because if it were gone, somebody might build a hotel there. There would be potential competition with Donald Trump's hotel across the street. They are going to put \$1.7 billion of taxpayers' money in there to protect his hotel from any competition, but there is no money in it to ensure people can safely vote in our upcoming elections. What is going on? This is "Alice in Wonderland."

In the absence of a President who takes this virus seriously or is able to lead this country through the crisis, the American public needs Congress to step up. The Republican proposal fails to do this. It leaves people behind and our country and our economy even more vulnerable.

Let's stop playing partisan games and offering solutions only one party can get behind. Let's get something we can all get behind. Let's start bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on a bill that can be sent to the President by the end of next week. Let's make priorities of those programs that help us contain this virus and help us protect the vulnerable families like those I have seen the past several days in Vermont—a bill that puts us on the right track to reopening our economy.

Frankly, the American people can't wait any longer. The Vermonters who call and write into my office and stop me in the street to talk with me, they are pleading for help. They can't wait

any longer. And to do nothing—to do nothing is an abdication of our sworn responsibility to serve our constituents.

But to advance this patchwork series of bills offered by the Republican majority is worse. It is a disservice to the thousands of Americans who have died and the millions of Americans who have contracted this virus and the hundreds of millions of Americans who are looking to their government to do something so they can have their country back.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Virginia.

(The remarks of Mr. KAINE pertaining to the introduction of S. 4349 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. KAINE. With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALS ACT

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, 4 years ago, Jill Larsen opened Crayons 2 Pencils Early Learning Center in Norwalk, IA. This state of the art childcare center offers full day, before and after school care, and preschool-only programs for children from 6 weeks old to school age. They have even expanded to include a learning center and recreation center. It truly is topnotch. But when COVID-19 hit, Crayons 2 Pencils' enrollment dropped from 150 children to 32. And it was only through the Paycheck Protection Program that this childcare center was able to stay afloat and keep their workers paid.

Jill Larsen's story is not unique. Without the help of the Paycheck Protection Program, so many of our small businesses and childcare programs across the country would have gone under. Ninety-nine percent of Iowa's businesses are small businesses, and the Paycheck Protection Program has been a critical lifeline for so many of them.

I hear it time and again on my 99-county tour—most recently on a Main Street tour in Albia with some outstanding female small business owners. Nearly 60,000 small businesses in Iowa have received PPP loans, saving hundreds of thousands of jobs. But, folks, there are more funds left in the program, and many of these folks need additional help. That is why we should allow our most distressed businesses to receive a second PPP loan—so they can continue to keep workers paid and their doors open. The HEALS Act would make that possible.

While the Paycheck Protection Program helped the Crayons 2 Pencils daycare center keep their employees paid, as folks are getting back to work, these critical facilities are facing new challenges—making up for losses from decreased enrollment, trying to expand to accommodate more kiddos due to school closures, or acquiring critical medical supplies or PPE to create a safe and clean environment for these families.

Just recently, I held a telephone townhall, and I was joined by Iowa's director of health and human services, Kelly Garcia. We heard the concerns of Iowa parents and talked about the solutions we are working on at the State and Federal levels when it comes to childcare access and affordability.

Our working parents are anxious and concerned about what lies ahead. Do they have to quit their jobs to stay at home with the kids? How much will childcare cost? What happens if childcare providers can't open back up?

This is the reality for so many. That is why I made it a top priority to provide additional resources for our childcare programs and our families. Included in the HEALS Act is my bill to create back-to-work childcare grants, which would give providers the resources they need to make it through this crisis. It would also help them access PPE and other medical supplies so they can adhere to the safety guidelines and provide a clean and safe environment.

But it doesn't stop there. I am also working to assist our lower income families, those who rely on the child care and development block grants and those who simply need access to clean diapers.

Just a couple of weeks ago, I was in Davenport, IA, where I got to take part in a diaper distribution with the Hiney Heroes of the Quad Cities—yes, Hiney Heroes. As a result of this visit, the folks over at Huggies and the National Diaper Bank donated 25,000 diapers to this important diaper bank. We know that during this pandemic, the diaper supply has run short. I have teamed up with Democratic Senator CHRIS MURPHY on this effort to include additional assistance for our diaper banks.

COVID-19 has also created challenges for our farmers. These hard-working folks are facing new challenges while working around the clock to make sure Americans have adequate access to food and fuel. I was visiting with some farmers at the Bloomfield Livestock Market in Davis County not long ago, and they described these hardships firsthand. I hear the same from our ethanol and biodiesel producers. That is why I helped ensure more aid for our farmers and producers, including our ethanol producers and so many other important commodities in Iowa.

In our rural communities—like Montgomery County, where I live—COVID-19 has only amplified existing financial pressures on our healthcare centers. Most rural hospitals rely on

services such as elective surgery to keep them financially afloat, but because of the pandemic and the response to it, many hospitals have had to cancel these elective surgeries as protective measures due to the pandemic.

Additionally, the need for PPE and other equipment has significantly increased.

Lower revenue combined with higher expenses has made it incredibly difficult for these rural hospitals to stay afloat. We absolutely can't leave these folks behind. We need our hospitals to keep their doors open so that quality healthcare is accessible to all Iowans, whether they live in the big cities like Des Moines and Polk County or small communities like Red Oak, where I live, in Montgomery County.

As I have toured Iowa over the last several weeks, I have also visited with many of our essential workers. Our nurses, grocery store clerks, truck-drivers, childcare providers, and so many more have been working on the frontlines of this pandemic, rising to the challenge to care for and protect Iowans. That is why I am pushing hard to allow these essential workers to keep more of their hard-earned dollars by suspending Federal income and payroll taxes. These folks deserve a reward for their tireless efforts.

No amount of financial relief will make this virus go away, but Congress has a role to play in helping families get back on their feet, but it is also every single one of us doing our part—wearing our masks, washing our hands, and social distancing as much as possible. Together, with the help of every individual and all levels of government, we will get through this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to talk about the portion of the bill that we have made available to our colleagues and the country this week after lots of input from our colleagues on the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education part of the bill. It is about 25 percent of the bill, almost \$250 billion. That money would be used to get us back on track toward vaccines that work, toward treatments that work, to provide additional resources for testing, for treatment, for care, to get us back to school, to get us back to work, and to get us back to childcare. These are all things that are critical for our economy and families to return in the way they want to.

For those things to work the way we would want them to work, our colleague Senator ALEXANDER put it very succinctly: All things run through testing. If you are going to go back to school, if you are going to go back to work, if you are going to go back to childcare, if you are going to be in a nursing home between now and the time we have a vaccine, we need tests that are easy to take and quick to respond. A test that you can take and have the answer in 10, 12, or 15 minutes

will make all the difference, and we continue to push for that in this bill.

In fact, there is about \$9 billion in a fund that maybe should have been designated a little more specifically, but it hasn't been spent. It was designed to be a testing fund. We should combine that with another \$16 billion and make testing available for those priorities—for nursing homes or in that State-Federal partnership.

In this bill, we say that a priority for the Federal Government in that partnership is tests that work in nursing homes, tests that work in childcare centers, tests that work in elementary and secondary education, and tests that work in colleges and universities, that allow people to get back into those situations, including a residential campus, to know that when you are there, you have a way to not only test people quickly but get an answer quickly.

Frankly, President Trump is right when he says that the way current testing has been working really doesn't do much but measure how many people had the disease. It doesn't even say how many people necessarily have the disease but how many people had the disease. If you have a test and you don't get an answer for 5 or 6 or 7 days, what good did it really do you to take the test? It certainly didn't do you much good in terms of not infecting others because you didn't know that you had it—particularly if you are in that high percentage of people who don't have symptoms but are still able to spread the disease.

That is why a test that gives you an answer in 15 minutes makes all the difference in the world. If you are on a college campus and take that test and in 15 minutes you have the answer, and if the answer is that you have this, your next place to go is somewhere by yourself.

I think almost every campus returning to residential campus living is setting aside some of their dorm space—on some campuses, all their dorm space is single-student dorm rooms—but for every campus I talked to, some rooms are set aside just so the student has a place to go.

If you show up at the nursing home as a worker and in 15 minutes you find out you have COVID, the last place you need to be is that nursing home. But if you don't know for 5 or 7 days whether you have COVID, it doesn't help out very much.

I think what the President has said on testing makes a lot of sense. But it doesn't mean the tests aren't good; it means better tests. We have put a lot of money and effort behind those tests. Sometime in the next few days, I think the National Institutes of Health will be announcing tests that are moving forward that will do just what I suggested.

We put another \$26 billion toward a vaccine. Our colleague Senator DAINES has been very helpful in looking at this organization called BARDA, which was

designed a decade ago to be able to respond to a pandemic and never has been effectively used in that way, in my view. This time, we are using it and intend to continue to use it to form those partnerships with the private sector early on to begin to produce a vaccine, even when we don't know absolutely for sure that it is going to be FDA-approved. But we do know that if it is FDA-approved, we want it as soon as it can possibly be available. If it is not FDA-approved, it never gets used, but if it is FDA-approved, the difference between a vaccine that is available January 15 and a vaccine that is available May 15—it is worth the loss if it doesn't work out. Let's say you went forward with five of these vaccines, and three of them worked. Then you have vaccines—maybe 300 million doses on January 15, and you have to destroy a couple of hundred million doses because that didn't get through the full safety requirement. That makes all the difference in the world. Lives are saved, and the economy is restored. And we are moving forward with that. We are putting another \$26 billion behind that.

We also have language in our bill that requires an effort that was announced yesterday, which is for a group of scientific ethicists to start talking about what the priorities should be for that vaccine when we have it. Who should get it first? What should our priorities be? How do we distribute this in a way that seems fair and equitable? How do we distribute this in a way that somebody who can't get in a car and drive 100 miles to a doctor and pay for the shot has the same chance to get the vaccine as somebody who could do all of those things? Our bill requires that.

All of our discussions on this bill, plus our public discussions in a hearing we had a month ago, have said we want the administration to have a plan as to how to distribute the vaccine before we have the vaccine. Everybody thinks we might have a vaccine available by the end of this year or early next year. There is no reason to wait for that to happen to have a plan. I would like to see a plan on October 1. I told the Chief of Staff of the President that again yesterday.

This bill provides money to be sure that people who go to places like community health centers are going to have a community health center that can respond to what they need. There is \$7.6 billion for community health centers.

There is another \$25 billion for providers that lost income—which is almost every provider—during the last several months as our hospitals and our doctors and our surgical centers and other places were told: Here is what we want you to do. We want you to stop your income. We want you to stop all the elective things you can possibly stop. At the same time, we want you to be ready for the greatest healthcare crisis your facility will ever meet.

So fully engaged in spending money and being ready to meet a crisis, but because you stopped income that you would normally have, we are trying to do what we can—not to exceed the income they would have normally had but to replace some of that income. There is also money for rural clinics that would step up and do that.

Senator CAPITO and Senator COLLINS were particularly vigorous in making sure we had the money needed for people who have mental health challenges, many of whom have gotten worse during this isolation period and this job-loss period, or if you or somebody in your family is sick.

The opioid deaths, the substance abuse deaths have gone back up for the first time in about 3 years. That is totally logical when you think about it. Had this headed in another direction, you would have a support system working that keeps you from returning to that habit, that dependency. Then you are suddenly by yourself. Maybe you are not only by yourself, but you are by yourself and you lost your job. Maybe you are by yourself, and your mother is sick with COVID, and you can't see your mom or dad or somebody in your family, and you are thinking: I wonder—surely I can do that thing that made me feel so good just one time and not be addicted. We know it doesn't work that way.

Our Nation continues to face challenges, and with those challenges, we have asked the National Institutes of Health to look one more time and more closely at people's underlying conditions that might put them more at risk for COVID-19, see what has happened with minorities, with pregnant women, with children, and begin to drill down and figure out what we can do.

As I have said before, bipartisan priorities should include school. Frankly, they also need to include childcare. If you are going to get America back to work, you are going to have to have a childcare system that works, and that is not going to happen on its own. About half of our childcare facilities have been closed since the 1st of March. The other half that has been open has struggled to stay open. Many have benefited from the PPP program, but at the same time, when they stay open or when others reopen with social distancing and the reluctance of people to send their kids back to a place where there are lots of other kids, there is probably no more than 50-percent occupancy. You are not going to make up for that by doubling the amount that families pay for childcare. You need to make up for that with the kinds of grants and assistance that are in this bill. It is about getting students back to school, getting people back to work, and getting childcare facilities working.

Senator ERNST, who was just on the floor, and Senator LOEFFLER have both been big advocates of what we need to do to make childcare a priority.

Schools need to reopen safely based on State and local criteria. This bill includes money for schools to do that. There is about \$70 billion for elementary and secondary schools. Frankly, we are a little bit ahead of where the House was with the Heroes Act. If you get into a bidding war with the House, you are never going to win. You need a realistic discussion. Only 90 days ago or so or 60 days ago, the House felt it needed \$100 billion to reopen schools. We suggested \$105 billion. In some report, I read that the House then decided, well, maybe it should be \$400 billion if the Senate were willing to spend \$105 billion.

We should be able to figure this out and figure this out quickly, with some of that money being available only if you go back to school in person and some of it being available if you go back to school virtually, as others will do, depending, again, on their situations locally.

We are ready to move forward. Answers to these important questions are in this bill. I look forward to talking about it not only with our Democratic colleagues in the Senate but with our colleagues in the House.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the relief that the HEALS Act will provide to those in farm country and rural America as they weather the challenges of COVID-19.

It is so important, for they are out there for us every day, producing that food supply. They had incredible challenges before this COVID-19 started. The Presiding Officer is from an ag State. He knows the kind of challenges we are facing. Obviously, we need to be there for them as we go through this coronavirus fight.

I want to start by thanking them. They provide us with the lowest cost, highest quality food supply in the world. Think about it. Every single American benefits every single day from what our farmers and ranchers do with food, fuel, and fiber. Just the food piece alone means that Americans have the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the history of the world. This is thanks to our farmers and ranchers. Rarely, if ever, has there been a more appropriate time to say thank you to the men and women who provide us with that food supply, and the resilience of our ag producers, in the face of tremendous hardship that has been caused by the global health pandemic, serves as a real testament to their grit and to their determination.

That is why we have worked to provide additional support for farmers, ranchers, and processors in this HEALS Act. The legislation includes \$20 billion in direct appropriation, which will be used for our farmers and ranchers, along with other funding that we were able to secure in the CARES Act. We are trying to also do it in a cost-effective way. In recognizing

that we have a debt and deficit we have to be mindful of, what we are trying to do is to actually utilize funding that we put together in the CARES Act for the CCC, or the Commodity Credit Corporation. We are taking \$14 billion of that and combining it with the \$20 billion from this legislation to make sure that we have adequate funding—a total of about \$34 billion—to address the needs in farm country.

Prior to the coronavirus, farmers entered 2020 after 7 years of rural recession caused by low commodity prices, trade disruptions, and some really tough weather and natural disasters. Yet our farmers and ranchers are the eternal optimists—they have to be—so they go into every year with that grit and determination and continue to provide that food supply that we all rely on.

Now, of course, you add COVID-19 into the mix. Storefronts have closed. Restaurants have shuttered their doors. Processing plants have limited and, in some cases, shut down operations. Of course, ag prices are also down. Farmers and ranchers came into a tough situation and now face further challenges with the pricing and the other challenges created by COVID-19, as I said. Though it will take some time to really quantify those losses, the reports we have right now indicate that losses in the ag sector could be near \$42 billion. For example, losses in the cattle industry alone could total as much as \$13 billion.

We need to be there for them because, again, they are not only out there producing the food; they are doing other things to help out as well. For example, there are a couple of stories about our farmer groups that are making an effort to help others.

In May, R.D. Offutt Farms, which is one of our Nation's premier potato growers that is based in Fargo, ND, donated 37,000 pounds of frozen potato products to the Great Plains Food Bank. The North Dakota Stockmen's Association and its foundation donated \$20,000 to the same food bank to purchase beef from North Dakota ranchers. The North Dakota Farmers Union and Farmers Union Enterprises teamed up to donate 30,000 pounds of pork ribs to the Great Plains Food Bank as well. Those types of stories go on.

So while the farmers and ranchers of America are out there, fighting their own challenges, they are helping others at the same time, and I think that it is truly, truly remarkable.

In the CARES Act, we took the first important step by providing \$9.5 billion to the USDA, the Department of Ag, along with the \$14 billion, which I just referenced, to replenish the CCC. As I mentioned earlier, we have utilized some of that funding to provide assistance, but now we are going to take that additional \$14 billion and combine it with the funding here of \$20 billion to make sure we can get that assistance off to the farmers.

Again, we are working to do this in a way that is prudent with our tax-

payers' dollars in recognizing the challenges we have with debt and deficit. We have to be mindful of it, but at the same time, we have to make sure we are getting adequate assistance out to those great farmers and ranchers across America who are getting it done for all Americans every single day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the HEALS Act.

As we continue to confront this coronavirus pandemic, we have to ensure that our schools and our employers can safely reopen. Our healthcare providers must also have the resources they need to continue to provide essential care to all Americans to fight this virus and to help this Nation return to some semblance of normalcy as quickly as possible. We have to also provide liability protection for those schools, businesses, and healthcare providers while they do their very best to operate safely during this unusual, once-in-a-generation, once-in-multiple-generations pandemic. The HEALS Act will help to provide these protections.

The HEALS Act also includes several provisions that I have been championing, including legislation to address unemployment insurance system reform.

We note that there have been a lot of challenges associated with the legacy computer systems, and we should never ever have to endure this again.

Financial assistance to help childcare providers reopen has also been another priority of mine. I recognize that our childcare providers play an essential role in not just caring for our children and ensuring they remain educated and in a safe environment when their parents aren't around but in also being critical to our broader economy. If your kids aren't taken care of, you can't go to work, and Hoosiers want to go to work.

Finally, we have telehealth legislation that has been included in this HEALS Act that will lead to greater affordability and access, especially as many of these authorities are made permanent in the future. This is a way to bend the cost curve down and provide a higher value for each of those healthcare dollars in our moving forward.

It also includes the TRUST Act, which is something that I helped to introduce in order to establish a bipartisan national plan to finally begin tackling the long-term drivers of our national debt once we get through this coronavirus pandemic. I have been talking about this and have sometimes been criticized for talking about fiscal responsibility and the largest drivers of our long-term national debt. I am unapologetic every time I talk about it. This TRUST Act would establish a bipartisan national plan to finally begin tackling this, and I hope it will remain in the package as negotiations continue.

Most importantly, I am glad the HEALS Act includes some really important features of my RESTART Act, which is a bipartisan piece of legislation that I introduced with Senator BENNET. We now have somewhere north of 42, 44 bipartisan cosponsors. We have 50 national groups—and growing—that are supportive of this legislation. It is very important that these features remain in the HEALS Act.

Like my RESTART Act, the HEALS Act recognizes the need for having long-term working capital loans and targeting that relief toward businesses that have suffered significant revenue decline. We don't want more examples of businesses that are doing just fine in the wake of the pandemic getting access to moneys that, frankly, they don't need. Instead, we want to target our resources toward the hardest hit businesses that will not survive this pandemic. That is what the RESTART Act does, and I am proud of those features that were included. However, I have to say, in order to truly assist the hardest hit small- and medium-sized enterprises that have fallen through the gaps of previous programs, more of the RESTART Act is going to have to be included throughout this negotiation process.

Last night, I received a text from a longtime friend of mine. Her name is Sheila. Sheila is a resident of Dearborn County, IN. Gosh, Sheila is an incredibly hard-working person, and she texted me the following:

Todd, I saw you on C-SPAN today. I really appreciate how you bring up the Hoosiers. When you are writing this next bill, please consider small businesses like my husband and I have. Pat is the lone legal owner of our catering business. We invested all of the revenue made over the few years into our business, buying equipment, et cetera. Because of this investment, we had an impressive schedule of events this past spring, summer, and fall lined up. This time of year gives our barbecue business our greatest exposure and opportunity for financial gain. We were ineligible for a PPP loan because we did not show a profit. When composing the next PPP, please consider single-person business owners like our barbecue and catering business. God bless you.

Well, God bless you, Sheila. It is hard-working people and couples and partnering Americans who help build this country. It is innovators and entrepreneurs and doers and dreamers and workers like Sheila.

If we don't provide this much needed relief now, I am really concerned that we are going to be in a far worse position in the weeks and months to come.

As more businesses close permanently, they go bankrupt; they are no longer paying payroll taxes. Then there is greater damage done to the economy and to our Nation's balance sheet.

I am also concerned about our ability as a country to fully recover once there is a vaccine available. It is our small and medium-sized enterprises, which you disproportionately find in States like Indiana, the heartland of the country, where so much innovation occurs. It is not always in these large busi-

nesses; it is the smaller enterprises where the innovation occurs. Then, ultimately, it is the big businesses that acquire these innovative businesses.

So we want these engines—these incubators of innovation, these small businesses, medium-sized businesses that are innovative and entrepreneurial—to survive this difficult time.

They are also pillars, frankly, of Main Street, America. We take pride in our small businesses, many of which have been so hard hit. We don't want to hollow out Main Street America on the back end of this. The most fiscally irresponsible thing we could do here at the Federal level of government is to fail to respond to the needs of these small and medium-sized enterprises.

So the additional assistance that I am calling for is critical to, for example, the more than 500,000 manufacturing employees in the State of Indiana, the most manufacturing-intensive State in the country.

It is also critical to the 200,000 Hoosier restaurant employees laid off or furloughed since March. We have been able to provide them some short-term assistance, but this virus and the challenges associated with it have lingered on much longer than all of us had hoped, and we are going to have to help out these employers so that they have a place to go back to work once we figure this thing out.

This assistance is critical to the small music venues that enrich our local communities throughout the State of Indiana and across our country, which are facing permanent closure, too, and the countless restaurants, gyms, salons, boutiques, hotels, retailers, and other small businesses that are essential pillars of our community.

I grew up in a small business family. We had our up years; we had our down years. We had some rough Christmases. My dad, my mom—they took great pride in that family business. They made it. They worked hard. But they saw nothing like this virus. We need to help these businesses. These businesses are in dire straits not because any bad business decisions were made, but, instead, because this virus came from overseas, disrupted our lives, and in the interest of public health, our employees had to stay home. People stopped buying the same things they were buying. Our shopping patterns changed.

At some point we will resume some semblance of normalcy. We are getting there. But in the meantime, we need a bridge to the other side of this virus. We need to make sure that all of the provisions of the RESTART Act make it into the HEALS Act.

Since Senator BENNET and I introduced the RESTART Act in May, our legislation has received support from more than 40 bipartisan Senators. I am proud of that. There is a lot of hard work going on in the U.S. House of Representatives to get Members of the House to sign up as well. It has also

been endorsed by roughly 50 national organizations and more than 50 Indiana businesses, and these are prominent national organizations, including, for example, the National Association of Manufacturers.

Given the widespread support for the RESTART Act, I will continue to work with my colleagues to ensure that more of it is included in the final coronavirus package. I hope we get all of it included. We have to ensure that we are caring for those who have suffered the most.

To Sheila and to Pat, you have my word—you have my word, as you did the first day we met, that I would do everything I could to fight for the people of Indiana, to fight for what is right, to fight tirelessly on behalf of my customers—you and the millions of Hoosiers I represent—answering only to my ultimate bosses: God and the Constitution.

I will fulfill that pledge and continue fighting for all of you during this difficult time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, first of all, I want to associate myself with the message delivered just a little bit ago by my senior Senator from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, and echo his words about the importance of farmers and ranchers, all of our agricultural producers—those who produce the food and the fiber and the fuel for our country.

They need assistance, and I am really grateful that Senator HOEVEN has played such a lead role in getting them assistance in the HEALS Act. It is critical.

I want to join the rest of my colleagues today in discussing the HEALS Act and demonstrating our support for the merit of this important bill. The ultimate answer to the problems that we face as a result of this virus, of course, lies in the healthcare industry and in our healthcare in fighting against this enemy, the virus. That is why we are calling for more funding for testing and treatments and, ultimately, a vaccine, hopefully, and hopefully soon.

As we do so, we also have to make sure that our economy is healthy, that our economy survives, and that our education system remains available and accessible to our students in the classroom.

Jobs, kids, and healthcare, students, parents, and patients—these are what Senate Republicans are fighting for.

I have introduced bipartisan legislation to further this goal. I believe we should include it in the HEALS Act in its entirety. Many pieces of it are in, but I think we can do more.

The Paycheck Protection Small Business Forgiveness Act would offer streamlined forgiveness for any borrower of a Paycheck Protection Program loan of \$150,000 or less who fills out a simple one-page form attesting that they spent the loan dollars the way they are supposed to.

With the expected forgiveness guidance from the bureaucracy, businesses and lenders will have to spend billions of dollars to receive the forgiveness that was promised them. In fact, we estimate that each borrower would have to spend \$2,000—and each lender \$500 per loan—just to comply with what the bureaucracy comes up with. That doesn't even include the dollars we have to spend on the bureaucracy itself.

We created the PPP to help small businesses and their employees survive, not to create a bureaucracy that will bury them in paperwork.

So who are these borrowers of PPP loans of \$150,000 or less? Well, loans of this size make up—listen to this—85 percent or 4.2 million of the loans but only 25 percent or \$132 million of the loaned amount. Imagine that: 85 percent of the loans are in this category—4.2 million of roughly 5 million loans. So that means 15 percent of the authorized PPP loans make up 75 percent of the borrowed money.

In North Dakota, the average loan was only \$91,000, but under current law, the bureaucracy would, regardless of loan size, seek to indiscriminately verify and approve forgiveness applications, and they haven't even come up with the form to do it with yet.

This would require a significant growth in the government and in the bureaucracy that we cannot afford, only to make small businesses and lenders spend time and money they can't afford to spend to comply with this bureaucracy. It makes no sense.

Lest we forget, when the Senate unanimously passed the CARES Act, we made our intent clear: PPP loans would become grants for the businesses that spent the money properly, and the banks were there to help guide them. There was no caveat that the loan would come with unnecessary bureaucracy. In fact, quite the opposite was true. The implication was that it would not come with additional bureaucracy.

The bipartisan bill that I introduced with Senators MENENDEZ, TILLIS, and SINEMA—and now has 25 Senate sponsors—would fulfill our original intent and the promise we made to lenders and applicants by creating a simple, accountability process for loan forgiveness.

Our bill also includes a provision which makes sure that the lenders will not be held responsible for improper actions of the borrowers, while still ensuring proper enforcement action can be taken if necessary. In fact, the accountability structure is intact.

When we passed the CARES Act, we literally encouraged businesses to apply for PPP and urged the bureaucracy and the lenders to get the money out the door fast. We were in a crisis. We were trying to keep people from being laid off and let go.

Largely, we were successful, but that success could be undone if we do not take the next steps properly. We shouldn't backtrack on the guidance

we gave lenders by holding them accountable for the decisions the borrowers made.

Fraud is a concern, for sure, which is why my proposal keeps all audit authorities intact. If a borrower falsely attests to using the funds correctly, the Federal Government is able to investigate and hold them accountable. If this sounds like a commonsense approach, that is because it is.

This bipartisan measure was popular from the start, and it is gaining support still, with a quarter of the Senate, a sizable number in the House, and now close to 200 business associations and groups from the entire political spectrum supporting it.

Why wouldn't it be popular? It aligns with the very same principles we are fighting for right here today—jobs, kids, and healthcare.

No small business owner figuring out how to safely send their kid to school should have to worry about unnecessary red tape. No employee of a shop on Main Street should have to live in fear of being laid off because their employer might not perfectly comply with the arbitrary requirements put forth for them by a bureaucrat in Washington. No brother, sister, son, or daughter should have to sit down and crunch the numbers to make sure they have enough money to apply for loan forgiveness while supporting their family at home.

The fear they face is real. “Small business” is not just an arbitrary designation. They are the backbone of America. They are the employers of the vast majority of people in our country, and their anxiety is our anxiety.

Earlier this month, Treasury Secretary Mnuchin told the House committee that this is an idea we should consider, and I agree. We should consider it in bipartisan negotiations and add it to the HEALS Act in its entirety. It will give our small businesses the peace of mind they need, like the rest of us, while they fight for their livelihoods during this pandemic.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to complete my remarks before the roll-call vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, first, let me say I concur with the comments by the Senator from North Dakota. I think he makes wonderful points about what is being done in terms of pandemic relief and the issues that we as a nation are facing.

As his State and mine are similar, with so many small businesses, and we see the impact and the success related to the Paycheck Protection Program, I just want to associate my beliefs with those that we have just heard expressed from the Senator from North Dakota.

PROTESTS

I come to the floor today to talk about another epidemic, and that is the epidemic of violence that is sweeping our country.

Monday's Washington Post headline warns: “Protests explode across the country; police declare riots in Seattle and Portland.”

Tuesday's Wall Street Journal editorial is headlined: “A Weekend of Urban Anarchy.” “A weekend of Urban Anarchy.” In Seattle, on Saturday, rioters blew a hole in a police precinct. They hurled explosives, and they injured 53 police officers. In Portland, rioters threw Molotov cocktails Friday night. Several officers were hit with heavy explosives. The rioters returned Sunday and attacked the courthouse.

In spite of what the Democrats say when they call these “peaceful protests,” these are not peaceful and they are not protests. This is active violence. This is organized violence, and it is meant to destroy and to intimidate.

Portland has now endured 60 days of senseless destruction. These violent protests are a powder keg for our entire Nation. The rioters threaten entire communities. They are ruining lives, and they are ruining neighborhoods. They are wrecking public property, and they are wrecking private property. They burn, they loot, and they kill.

Across the country, a number of police officers have been killed. According to the New York Times report, murder rates in our big cities are now up 16 percent compared to last year. In New York alone, murders are up 24 percent. In Atlanta, murder is up 31 percent. In Chicago, murder is up 51 percent. In Chicago, last week, 15 people were shot while attending the funeral of a victim of gang violence. Children are being hurt and killed. A 7-year-old girl and a 14-year-old boy were among those shot and killed in Chicago over the Fourth of July weekend.

This is a crisis of leadership in our liberal cities. Where are the Democratic mayors? They have surrendered to the mob. Where are the Democratic Governors? They have surrendered to the mob. Instead of leading, they are turning their backs on the safety and security of the law-abiding citizens of our communities. In these liberal cities, mob rule has replaced the rule of law. We are seeing in realtime—in realtime—the result of the radical “defund the police” movement that is embraced by many Democrats.

We should defend, not defund, the police and law enforcement. Americans do not want to defund the police. According to a recent Rasmussen poll, two out of three Americans oppose cutting police funding. A majority say that they want the Federal Government to help fight crime in these cities. One thing is clear: The violent rioting plaguing our cities cannot continue. The police are being targeted for doing their job, and their jobs come at great personal risk. At the same time, elected Democratic mayors and city

council members and Governors refuse to condemn the rioting and the cold-blooded murder.

It is time for local leaders to restore law and order. It is time to make sure our communities are safe again. The death and destruction lies at the feet of elected Democratic leaders. Each must be held accountable for their leadership failure.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Marvin Kaplan, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2025. (Reappointment)

Mitch McConnell, Joni Ernst, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Marsha Blackburn, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Shelley Moore Capito, Todd Young, John Boozman, Lamar Alexander, David Perdue, Kevin Cramer, Tim Scott, Michael B. Enzi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Marvin Kaplan, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2025, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or to change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 148 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeben	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	Lankford	Shelby
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Loeffler	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Jones	Shaheen
Brown	Kaine	Sinema
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	
Harris	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—2

Cruz Markley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 52, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Marvin Kaplan, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2025. (Reappointment)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kaplan nomination?

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 149 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeben	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	Lankford	Shelby
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Loeffler	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Cardin	Durbin
Bennet	Carper	Feinstein
Blumenthal	Casey	Gillibrand
Booker	Coons	Harris
Brown	Cortez Masto	Hassan
Cantwell	Duckworth	Heinrich

Hirono	Murray	Stabenow
Jones	Peters	Tester
Kaine	Reed	Udall
King	Rosen	Van Hollen
Klobuchar	Sanders	Warner
Leahy	Schatz	Warren
Manchin	Schumer	Whitehouse
Menendez	Shaheen	Wyden
Merkley	Sinema	
Murphy	Smith	

NOT VOTING—2

Cruz Markley

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Alabama.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 585

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I rise today amid what we all know to be a global health and economic crisis that we are in. I rise to propose a solution that has been in front of us all along from the very beginning. It is a solution that has existed for 55 years tomorrow—55 years.

Medicaid has brought millions of people to better healthcare. It has brought billions of dollars into States. That is important when we have both a healthcare crisis and an economic crisis, but for 55 years, Medicaid has lifted the health outcomes of people all across this country and especially in so many States that need it—States like Alabama that are poor States, that are unhealthy States.

But we can do better. A solution of Medicaid would bring billions of dollars into my home State of Alabama along with about a dozen other States. It would create thousands of new jobs. It would help shore up rural hospitals that are facing financial struggles, a condition made worse by this pandemic. It would provide healthcare coverage in Alabama alone to between 300,000 to 400,000 Alabamians who do not have it right now. Some didn't have it before this pandemic. Others don't have it now because they have lost their jobs. They have lost their employer-sponsored healthcare.

Expanding Medicaid would generate \$935 billion, with a "b," in new tax revenue for the State of Alabama. It would help local economies across the State by creating good jobs and ensuring workers and their families have good healthcare.

In our rural areas, especially, healthcare is dependent on Federal dollars. Folks, expanding Medicaid was the right thing to do before this pandemic and some 37 States or so did just that. In fact, two States did that fairly recently. Conservative States of Oklahoma and Nebraska are both in the process of expanding Medicaid. It was important before the pandemic, but it is vital that we do it now. It is absolutely vital, especially, as so many people have lost their jobs, lost their employer-sponsored healthcare through no fault of their own.

Alabama didn't take that step back in 2011 when it should have. Alabama

held back. There is little doubt that the main reason—not the sole reason—but the main reason that they held back was purely political. The Alabama Legislature and the Alabama Governor refused to legitimize the Affordable Care Act and put their name on anything having to do with it. The people of Alabama—hundreds of thousands—have suffered because of it.

That excuse is waning thin today, especially when so much is needed to provide healthcare to the people of my State. Just this morning, a new poll came out from Auburn University that showed that a majority of the people of Alabama, including a majority of Republicans and a majority of Democrats, favor expanding Medicaid. Our hospitals and healthcare professionals have long advocated for this all across Alabama.

We did a program just recently. The American Hospital Association has been begging for this for years to keep our hospitals open. They advocated for an understanding that without this, more and more of our hospitals will have to close their doors. They are working on either thin margins or they are underwater already, and the pandemic has made it worse. More than a dozen of our hospitals, rural and urban, have shuttered while Alabama has refused to expand Medicaid.

Today, we have a chance to save the ones we still have and perhaps even revive some outpatient services that have lost their provider. Every pregnant mother who has to drive hours for a round trip for prenatal appointments or a rural Alabamian who lives 45 miles from the nearest emergency room or the workers who are employed would benefit from this. Those who still do not have good healthcare and have to take their children to an emergency room for routine healthcare, it is for those people that I am committed to finding a way to expand Medicaid.

Today, I stand with my colleague Senator WARNER from Virginia to once again call for the passage of our proposal to incentivize States to expand Medicaid. Our bill, the SAME Act, States Achieving Medicaid Expansion Act, would restore the financial incentives for States that expanded late and would give them the same fair shot at Federal support as the early expanding States.

The legislation would have the Federal Government cover 100 percent of the costs for the first 3 years, then would scale back to eventually cover 90 percent in perpetuity.

I want to make sure folks understand this bill does not mandate an expansion of Medicaid; it still gives States the choice. If the 13 or 14 States, including Alabama, choose not to expand Medicaid, even with a second bite of the apple, then they don't have to. Shame on them for not doing so, but they don't have to do it. More importantly, if they were to do that, thousands of people would get this healthcare coverage, including a very

important point for the State of Alabama, which is expanded mental health coverage. So many places that I have been to in the State of Alabama are begging for mental health coverage that they cannot afford in their communities. Expanding Medicaid would do just that.

Let me be clear. Even without this bill, I still believe Alabama should take this step. We literally can't afford not to. We need to be investing in our citizens' health the same way we invest in trying to bring businesses into Alabama. We need to try to invest in our people's health because it will lift all boats.

If this incentive is what is needed to get us over the finish line, let's just do it. Again, it is not mandated. States don't have to do it. But for those States that do, they will see better health outcomes for their citizens and better economic advantages in areas that need it. Millions of Americans in these remaining States are struggling, and we can no longer allow politics to get in the way of their access to quality healthcare.

I urge my colleagues to please let my State have the chance. Let us have the opportunity to right the wrong that we did in 2011 by refusing to expand. Give me that opportunity to go back and try to convince the folks in Montgomery, AL, that this is the right thing to do. It is a commonsense solution. Let's not stand in the way of more Americans getting healthcare amid a global health crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I want to thank the Senator from Alabama for his partnership on the SAME Act. I am going to repeat some of the same arguments he made because I think they are quite compelling.

We are talking about healthcare, which is an issue that is weighing on too many American families at this point—and not just healthcare but access to healthcare coverage. I think we would all agree that regardless of what we feel about this issue, we are in the midst of the greatest public healthcare crisis in generations. In this unprecedented time, I think it calls for unprecedented action from Congress.

Today, in a couple of moments, I am going to ask that this Senate take up and unanimously pass legislation I introduced along with Senator JONES from Alabama and several of my colleagues—legislation that could provide access to quality and affordable healthcare coverage for millions of Americans. To be clear, the SAME Act is the bill I have been pushing for more than 3 years. This bill was a good idea before the pandemic, but the need for it has become even greater in light of the COVID-19 outbreak.

The SAME Act would ensure that States like Virginia—and we did pass Medicaid expansion, but we passed it

later than other States—that States that have expanded their Medicaid Program to serve more Americans can get their fair share of Federal matching dollars.

It would also incentivize additional States—like the State of Alabama which hasn't yet expanded Medicaid—to expand this critical program to millions of more Americans. I can think of no better time to pass this legislation than right now, when more than 5 million Americans find themselves having lost their healthcare coverage in the last 3 months alone.

In fact, some reports actually estimate that nearly 27 million Americans have lost their employer-sponsored health insurance and are now in jeopardy of becoming uninsured.

Our legislation would provide much needed financial support to States that are seeing an increase in Medicaid enrollment as folks face the fallout of this crisis. For those millions of people, the SAME Act would provide a significant lifeline. Estimates show that if every State were to expand its Medicaid Program, about 3 million additional Americans would have healthcare coverage.

I don't believe this is a political argument nor a philosophical exercise. This legislation has a real-world impact, and it is clear that Americans want and need this legislation to pass.

As my colleague just mentioned, there are a number of States—Red States and Blue States—which have taken advantage of this opportunity, including, just recently, Oklahoma. A few weeks ago, Oklahomans went to the polls and voted to expand their Medicaid Program to provide broader access to coverage. We have seen similar actions from citizens in Utah, Maine, Idaho, and others. Across our Nation, Americans are making it clear that they want expanded access to healthcare coverage, and I believe Congress needs to listen.

With all due respect to my Republican colleagues, you can't say you want to help Americans in this devastating time and simultaneously oppose this bill, which would actually provide that help.

As we stand here in this Chamber, we have the privilege of knowing that we and our families have access to the healthcare coverage we need so that, if something were to go wrong, we would be covered. So why shouldn't we ensure the same access for more Americans? The median cost of a hospitalization due to COVID-19 is \$14,000. For Americans without health insurance—the nearly 30 million and growing—that could mean losing their homes or their cars. For many, it could put them into bankruptcy.

Now, I know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to do right by their constituents and the millions of other Americans who need help. So I ask us to come together today to support the SAME Act. No one should go bankrupt because one

got sick and sought medical care, but more importantly, no one should go bankrupt when this legislative body has the opportunity to act.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 585, the States Achieve Medicaid Expansion Act; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, in reserving the right to object, I appreciate we all want to help Americans get the healthcare they need, but what my colleagues are proposing is a Federal bailout that will help a handful of States but do little to directly help patients. That is not fair to Americans across the Nation who need better access to affordable healthcare.

We have seen that a government takeover of healthcare does not work. ObamaCare was sold on a lie, plain and simple. Let's remember, when ObamaCare passed, they promised it would save \$2,500 per family. Not true. Costs and premiums went up. They promised that you could keep your doctor. Not true. Provider networks got narrower, and people lost their doctors. They promised, if you liked your plan, you could keep it. Again, this was not true. The promise of ObamaCare didn't happen. Actually, the opposite happened. Under ObamaCare, costs skyrocketed, and families lost the doctors they liked.

The American people don't want more lies. Actually, they want more solutions. The solution is not to create more inequity in the system. What we need is to take concrete steps to make sure we help all families across the Nation actually get the healthcare they need. My colleague's bill does nothing to help patients. States will make their own decisions on Medicaid. Giving certain States free Medicaid is nothing more than a bailout for State budgets.

In June, I wrote to all 50 Governors and requested information on how their States have allocated the trillions of dollars in taxpayer funding from the Federal coronavirus response measures that had been passed by Congress. Unfortunately, a majority of the States simply chose not to respond, including Virginia and Alabama.

The Federal Government already allocated \$1 trillion to States and local governments to respond to the coronavirus, but these States are refusing to tell us how they are spending these extra funds, including the estimated extra \$50 billion in Federal Medicaid dollars they received in the Families First Act. Since the Families First Act has passed, Medicaid costs have actually gone down, but the States don't want to tell us that because they simply want bailouts.

Instead of pursuing a partisan bailout of a select number of States, I want to use this opportunity to propose a commonsense solution that would use bipartisan principles to help every single American in this country. Though ObamaCare was a failure, I support protecting people with preexisting conditions and ensuring that young adults can stay on their parents' health plans until age 26. I think my colleagues would also support these principles.

I have been working with Senator TILLIS on the PROTECT Act, which would directly assist Americans by, one, guaranteeing coverage for preexisting conditions and prohibiting insurance companies from excluding coverage of treatment for a patient's preexisting condition; two, prohibiting insurance companies from charging Americans higher premiums due to their preexisting conditions; and, three, guaranteeing the availability of health insurance coverage in the employer or individual market regardless of one's preexisting condition. My amendment builds on the PROTECT Act and adds protections to allow young adults to stay on their parents' health insurance plans until they are 26.

We could pass this amendment, which I believe has bipartisan support, and ensure that every American with a preexisting condition is protected no matter how the Supreme Court rules on ObamaCare.

The American people and, certainly, the people of Florida, Virginia, and Alabama want us to get something done that would actually reduce healthcare costs and increase access to care. That is what my proposal does. Protecting Americans with preexisting conditions is a commonsense step we can and should take today to lower the costs of healthcare for all Americans. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting these bipartisan healthcare reforms.

Therefore, I ask the Senator to modify his request to include my substitute amendment, which is at the desk; that it be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, in reserving the right to object, I have great respect for my friend, the Senator from Florida. I know he has a long and deep background in healthcare, but I have some news. The Affordable Care Act already provides strong protections for millions of Americans with preexisting conditions.

I believe, unfortunately, the legislation my colleague is proposing would allow insurance companies to, once again, impose arbitrary annual and lifetime cap limits on care, and it would allow insurance companies to refuse to cover essential health bene-

fits, like mental health coverage, substance use disorder, or maternity care.

I don't believe we can go back to the days when a certain number of companies held all the power and consumers were routinely denied access to healthcare. I do believe the SAME Act—again, sponsored by my good friend, the Senator from Alabama—would simply continue to extend the right to have the same level of Federal subsidies for all States. We are seeing voters across the country, as they have a chance to weigh in on this, agree to this principle, which is that those same rights ought to be extended to States like Alabama, which has chosen not to move forward, and to States like Virginia, which has moved forward but a little bit late. I still strongly believe that the SAME Act, which would equalize and level the playing field, is the appropriate action.

Respectfully, I object to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Florida to pass this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, in reserving the right to object, first of all, I thank my colleagues, and I hope to work with them to figure out how we can drive healthcare costs down because, as we know in all of our States, healthcare costs are too high, and as my colleagues have said, we have people who are being impacted because they can't afford the cost of healthcare.

I am clearly disappointed. My colleagues don't want to protect those with preexisting conditions and ensure that young adults can stay on their parents' plans until age 26 if ObamaCare is actually ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Whether by figuring out how to bring drug prices down or just the whole cost of healthcare, I hope that we can figure out how to work together because the costs shouldn't be this high.

Therefore, respectfully, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WARNER. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2024. (Reappointment)

Mitch McConnell, Joni Ernst, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Marsha Blackburn, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Shelley Moore Capito, Todd Young, John Boozman, Lamar Alexander, David Perdue, Kevin Cramer, Tim Scott, Michael B. Enzi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2024, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or to change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 150 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Feinstein	Peters
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Bennet	Graham	Rosen
Blumenthal	Harris	Sanders
Blunt	Hassan	Schatz
Booker	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	Jones	Sinema
Cardin	Kaine	Sinema
Carper	King	Smith
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Cornyn	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—41

Barrasso	Hoeven	Roberts
Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Boozman	Inhofe	Rounds
Braun	Johnson	Rubio
Capito	Kennedy	Sasse
Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lee	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Loeffler	Shelby
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Enzi	McSally	Tillis
Fischer	Paul	Toomey
Gardner	Perdue	Wicker
Grassley	Portman	Young
Hawley	Risch	

NOT VOTING—3

Burr	Cruz	Moran
------	------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 56, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2024. (Reappointment)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the McFerran nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 151 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Gillibrand	Reed
Baldwin	Graham	Rosen
Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hassan	Schatz
Booker	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	Jones	Sinema
Cardin	Kaine	Smith
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cornyn	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Daines	Murkowski	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	

NAYS—42

Barrasso	Hawley	Risch
Blackburn	Hoeven	Roberts
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Braun	Inhofe	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Rubio
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sasse
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Lee	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Loeffler	Shelby
Enzi	McConnell	Thune
Ernst	McSally	Tillis
Fischer	Paul	Toomey
Gardner	Perdue	Wicker
Grassley	Portman	Young

NOT VOTING—5

Blunt	Cruz	Moran
Burr	Manchin	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

HEALS ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor to talk about some of the steps that Congress should take in response to the coronavirus pandemic. I am going to start with talking about the legislation that the majority leader, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, introduced yesterday.

One of the aspects of it that hasn't gotten much attention and that, I think, is very positive and a very effective way to get the economy moving in a safe way is with some tax legislation. These are tax credits and tax deductions that help to encourage the hiring of new workers but that also do so in a safe way. These are the kinds of things that make a lot of sense and that have a lot of bipartisan support and appeal, so I think it should be part of whatever final package we end up with.

The goal of these tax incentives is to say that we want people to reenter the workforce but to do it in a safe and sustainable way. For example, in the McConnell proposal is legislation I have introduced, called the Healthy Workplaces Tax Credit Act. It is very simple. It says there will be a credit on the employer's side of payroll taxes against qualified employee protection expenses and workplace reconfiguration expenses to ensure employers can afford additional safety measures.

As I travel around the State of Ohio, I see the Plexiglas dividers. You have probably seen those in offices where there are more open settings. You see it in a lot of retail places now. There is a cost to that, but there is also a cost to personal protective gear—the masks and the gowns and the gloves and the other things that people are needing in order to have a safe workplace. As I have been in some of the factories around Ohio, I have also seen that they have had to reconfigure the factory spaces in order to provide more social distancing. At one plant, in its floor plan, it had expanded the lunchroom in order to provide more social distancing, and that, of course, meant there was less space for manufacturing. These are costs, and these are the kinds of things that could be part of this credit.

So my hope is, whether it is a thermometer check or whether it is more testing or whether it is PPE or whether it is more hand sanitizer, that we could encourage people to use these things by having a tax credit. It would provide an immediate stimulus to the economy as well, which is a good thing because many businesses would be operating at a loss and not have taxable income, but they would have payroll tax liability, and this is a credit to the payroll tax.

It also applies, by the way, to non-profits, as it should, and to the 501(c)(3)s. I was at one of the alcohol and drug addiction entities in one of our counties the week before last, and it had Plexiglas up. Frankly, it is hurting in terms of its budget right now, but it felt like it had to have a safe place for people to work. We want everybody to have a safe place. We want

people to go back to work and to go back safely.

I commend Senator MCCONNELL for including that bill in the CARES 2.0 package that was released this week. This tax credit will support efforts to make the workplace safe and healthy and build consumer confidence in that all of the appropriate measures are being taken. It is important to get consumers back in the mix. Whether it is going back into a restaurant and feeling safe or going back to a retail establishment, if people feel safe, they are more likely to go back, and this economy can get going again. So I think it is something, again, both sides of the aisle should be able to support, and it will show we are doing everything we can to get people back to more normal lives.

Second, with the unemployment rate still at about 11 percent, we need to encourage hiring and employee retention as this virus continues to affect our economy. In the McConnell proposal, we have a way to create this incentive that builds on legislation we have already passed in the form of the work opportunity tax credit. This is an existing law that gives employers an incentive to hire individuals who might not otherwise be able to get a job.

Categories now include, as an example, our veterans. So, if you are a veteran and are having a tough time getting a job, you can go through the work opportunity tax credit, and the employer can get a credit for hiring you initially. By the way, almost everyone I talk to says these people end up being hired full time and being paid their full wages. In the meantime, they get a credit to bring them on during a first transition period, so it works.

Another category, as an example, is the folks who have been let out of prison. Second chance individuals have a chance under the work opportunity tax credit, WOTC, to get a job.

We have proposed adding a new category, which is qualified COVID-19 employees—those who are on unemployment insurance immediately prior to their hiring date. It increases the work opportunity tax credit amount for this new targeted group of individuals from 40 percent of the first \$6,000 in qualified wages to 50 percent of the first \$10,000 in qualified wages. Again, it encourages us to help get people off unemployment insurance and back to work. Let's say they work for a company that is not going back because of COVID-19. Let's say it is a movie theater or a bowling alley or, maybe, a bar. Those individuals would qualify.

Third, I support a proposal in this McConnell draft that builds on what is called the employee retention tax credit. That is already in law. We put it in law in the first CARES Act. The credit was a good start, but it needs to be updated and expanded given the course of our economy since March and what has happened with the coronavirus. This credit applies to employers who have operations partially or fully suspended

due to COVID-19 and any related government order saying that one has to shut down but has chosen to retain one's affected employees. It is a credit that increases from the CARES 1 from 50 to 65 percent per employee—from \$10,000 under current law for the whole year and \$10,000 per quarter. It also helps businesses that have had a 25-percent decline in revenues, not a 50-percent decline in revenues.

It is for the group of companies that may not have qualified for a PPP credit or a PPP loan—they may not have gotten one—but is having a tough time keeping their workers. This would encourage them to keep those workers and to bring on new workers. Again, it is the kind of support that our workforce needs as the economy reopens and companies resume ramping up operations. It helps to bring people off the unemployment rolls. It is a pull into the workforce, and that is a good thing.

These are commonsense proposals. What is more, historically, they have been policies that have had bipartisan support. I worked with my friend Senator BEN CARDIN, on the other side, in designing the employee retention tax credit back in March, and expanding the work opportunity tax credit has always had bipartisan support.

On the healthy workplace credit, Senator SINEMA, of Arizona, has a similar bill that goes a little further, but it is very similar. I see no reason we can't take what we all agree on works and make it even better in this new package.

Again, these tax incentives are the kind of bipartisan consensus-builders that we ought to be looking at right now to get into a new package, hopefully, by the end of this week. We have to ensure—I think all of us agree—the safe reopening of our economy, and these tax provisions do that.

CHINA

Mr. President, another aspect of the COVID-19 legislation is a part of the bill that focuses on how we deal with bringing back our personal protective gear production from overseas, particularly from China, and how to deal with the concern we have that other countries are taking the research we are doing on therapies and cures. By the way, there are substantial, more resources, billions of dollars that go into that in this bill. Right now, in labs all around America, some of the best and brightest minds are at work on therapies, cures, and vaccines for COVID-19. It has changed all of our lives in the past few months, and we stand to benefit from these medical breakthroughs, and we want them to have them. So, again, Congress has already appropriated billions of dollars. In the McConnell proposal, there are billions more for this purpose, and that is appropriate.

Yet, as we work to find a cure, there are troubling reports emerging that China, in particular, is actively trying to take this research for itself. As the

FBI and the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency warned in May, there has been a pattern of "targeting and compromise of U.S. organizations conducting COVID-19-related research by PRC-affiliated cyber actors and non-traditional collectors."

FBI Director Wray was even more pointed about this threat earlier this month, stating on July 7: "At this very moment, China is working to compromise American health care organizations, pharmaceutical companies, and academic institutions conducting essential COVID-19 research."

Just last week, the Justice Department filed charges against a Chinese researcher who failed to disclose her ties to the People's Liberation Army while conducting medical research at Stanford University. While she was not accused of stealing the research in this case, this kind of arrangement, wherein scholars are essentially agents of the Chinese Government in order to gain access to our cutting-edge labs around the country to find research to sneak back into China, is all too common.

That China would attempt to steal our research for its own benefit is, unfortunately, not surprising. As we have all seen over the past few months, China's failure to live up to its international commitments on critical issues like transparency and human rights have led to some of the issues we have had, particularly with regard to the lack of transparency on the unchecked spread of the coronavirus from Wuhan.

Frankly, relations with China are not good right now, in part, because of that. Unfortunately, our problems with China extend to our labs and our universities. As chair of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, I led a bipartisan investigation last year into this issue. Over the course of a year, we learned how the Chinese Communist Party has used so-called talent recruitment programs—notably, its Thousand Talents Plan—to systematically target the most promising U.S.-based research and researchers and pay them to take their American taxpayer-funded research back to Chinese universities.

While stealing this research is bad enough, what is worse is that it is not taken for academic purposes. Instead, according to the State Department witness at our hearing last November, "the Chinese Communist Party has declared the Chinese university system to be on the front line of military-civilian fusion efforts for technology acquisition." That means there is a clear link between the research being taken from American labs and the latest advancement in China's military and its economy.

There has been more recent attention to this topic of research theft, which is a good thing. We need to talk about it and we need to expose it and we need to deal with it. Recently, both FBI Director Wray and Attorney General Barr

have spoken about this threat. In fact, Director Wray announced that the FBI is opening a new China-related investigation on this topic every 10 hours—a new investigation every 10 hours—with around 2,500 counterintelligence investigations now going on around the country.

We have seen this type of research theft in my home State of Ohio, unfortunately.

Just a couple of months ago, a National Institutes of Health-funded researcher, affiliated with both the Cleveland Clinic and Case Western Reserve University, was accused of hiding that he had received more than \$3 million from the Chinese Government to effectively take and replicate his Cleveland Clinic research at a lab in China. He is actually accused of taking biological samples from Cleveland, OH, to Wuhan, China. And this was taxpayer-paid research by the NIH.

He is not alone. The NIH has recently reported that 54 scientists and researchers have either resigned or been fired as a result of an NIH investigation into American taxpayer-funded grant recipients for their failure to disclose financial ties to foreign governments, particularly China. In fact, according to the NIH investigation, more than 90 percent of the scientists had undisclosed ties to China.

Unfortunately, as it stands, our law enforcement agencies can't go directly after these researchers for hiding their foreign conflict of interest—for not telling the truth—while taking taxpayer money.

As important as it is that we speak out against these improper actions by China around the world, it is also critical that we take steps to clean up our own house right here in the United States and make America more resilient against China. One way we can do that is by stopping research developed in our labs and universities from going to benefit China's military and economy at our expense.

I am pleased to say we have an opportunity to change that right now because this legislation is included in the COVID-19 legislation and in doing so take a stand in a bipartisan manner in defense of our values of research transparency, collaboration, fairness, and national security.

Our legislation is called the Safeguarding American Innovation Act, and I introduced it, along with Senator Tom Carper and a group of bipartisan Senators, to ensure that individuals are held accountable for failing to disclose their foreign ties on Federal grant applications. It will also reform the State Department's vetting process for issuing visas to foreign researchers. It will require more safeguards on sensitive research from our research institutions and our universities and will help us better track who is working on taxpayer-funded research.

This bill is ready to pass the Senate. The Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee voted to ap-

prove it last week with bipartisan and unanimous consent.

I am pleased to say that, again, Leader McConnell has chosen to include this legislation in his phase 5 proposal, the CARES 2.0 package, because it will help protect taxpayer-funded COVID-19 research and serve as a safeguard for the \$150 billion that Americans give to scientists to conduct research every year. That is the taxpayer funding that goes into our research institutions. In that regard, including the Safeguarding American Innovation Act in this CARES 2.0 bill can and should be viewed as a fiscally responsible measure as we continue to take a firmer stance against behavior that China has gotten away with for way too long.

Let's do all we can to put vulnerable American institutions on a solid footing as well. It is time to put an end to the Chinese Communist Party's theft of our taxpayer-funded research, including COVID-19 research.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the Safeguarding American Innovation Act.

MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION PLANS

Mr. President, I am also here on floor today to talk about another critical issue we should be addressing.

As we speak, there continues to be a looming crisis involving what is called our multiemployer pension system, and without reform, it is going to result in pension benefit cuts of over 90 percent for more than 1.4 million American workers and retirees and unnecessary bankruptcies for a lot of small businesses, including many in my home State of Ohio.

Multiemployer pension plans are defined benefit plans maintained by a lot of different companies, multiple companies, and a labor union that pool together their pension assets to cover all workers and retirees in the plan. The multiemployer system now comprises roughly 1,400 plans covering almost 11 million participants and their families.

Unfortunately, it is on the verge of collapse. Years of bad Federal policy with respect to funding and withdrawal, liability rules, losses on risky investments, and failure to take proactive action have led to this crisis, and the current economic slowdown caused by the coronavirus has made the situation even worse.

Not only is the system underfunded by about \$638 billion, but the Federal entity that insures these pensions, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, is also projected to become insolvent in less than 5 years. So the multiemployer part of the PBGC, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, is projected to become insolvent in less than 5 years. We can't let that happen.

In my home State of Ohio, we have more than 50,000 active workers and retirees in multiemployer pension plans who are facing deep benefit cuts if we do nothing, with hundreds of small businesses contributing to these plans that could be forced to close if we fail to act.

There are about 200 small businesses in Ohio that are going to have huge liabilities, many of which are not going to be able to continue to operate. We can't let that happen.

Nearly 42,000 of those Ohioans, by the way—many of them veterans—participate in a single plan called the Central States Pension Fund, which is also the largest plan considered to be in what is called critical and declining status and is projected to become insolvent by 2025. It is that insolvency that will take down the PBGC if it is not already insolvent.

The good news is that proactive action now will reduce the cost of fixing the problem, will ensure a secure retirement for these participants and their families, and will ensure certainty for employers to make investments in good-paying jobs.

The further good news is that the House Democratic proposal which passed as part of the Heroes Act—it is called the Emergency Pension Plan Relief Act—is more similar to the Senate version, the Senate Republican structure, than the previous Democratic plan. So not only is the Democratic plan in their COVID-19 response bill, called the Heroes Act, but it is also more similar in structure to legislation that some of us have been working on over here on the Senate side. That means we have a better shot, I believe, this year than we have had in a long time to try to solve this crisis and do it in a bipartisan way.

In my view, in order to solve this, it is going to entail three key principles:

First, we are all in this together, and that means we all have a shared responsibility.

House Democrats have proposed using only taxpayer money to rescue these plans. None of the stakeholders are asked to, again, have any shared responsibility. That is not the way to get bipartisan support in Congress. Employers and participants must also share the responsibility, especially since about 94 percent of taxpayers do not participate in this system, many of whom are struggling with their own retirement security. As an example, somewhat higher employer contributions are required if multiemployer plans are to sustainably provide the benefits they promise.

Second, we need to ensure that we safeguard the long-term financial health of the PBGC so we aren't back in this fiscal crisis again soon. Part of that should be a new, small, variable-rate premium for plans, but we also need participants in federally rescued plans to pitch in with solvency fees paid directly to the PBGC. These do not have to be large payments.

The Federal Government and the taxpayer, I think, are willing to play a role as long as this is viewed as something that is part of shared responsibility. But it is important that all stakeholders are contributing to the health of the PBGC in addition to us

here in Congress and therefore the taxpayers because insolvency would be in no one's interest.

Finally, we have to ensure that there is long-term solvency for these multi-employer plans. That entails enacting some restructuring, some structural reforms to the funding rules governing employer contributions so that bailing out these plans doesn't become a habit of the Federal Government. We don't want to fix this problem and be right back in a few years having to fix it again.

We should gradually phase down the rate of return which plans assume in budgeting for promises that are made to participants, partly because that keeps these plans from going bankrupt and partly because that is just fair. Investment risk is a problem in these plans now, and we need to give more certainty to workers and retirees.

The pension crisis is an issue that I, along with Senator GRASSLEY, Senator SHERROD BROWN from Ohio, and many other colleagues here in the Senate, have been trying to solve for quite a long time. We had a bicameral and bipartisan solution very close at hand at the conclusion of a committee process that ended about a year and a half ago, but we weren't quite able to get there. I think it is achievable, particularly now, but only if we are willing to listen to each other and willing to come around the table for a real discussion.

Republicans have reached out. I reach out today. We are ready to find an acceptable compromise. We are ready to talk, but that discussion needs to be driven by the merits of solving this issue, not just the politics of the moment. We owe solving this problem to those beneficiaries—the retirees, the workers, the active workers in these plans—and to the small businesses participating in these plans. We have to find common ground. We have to deliver a sustainable and lasting solution.

I believe we have an opportunity right now, this month, to try to come together, working with the House and the Senate and the administration. Everybody has a responsibility to do it. We talked about shared responsibility with regard to the plans; there is also a shared accountability here in the U.S. Congress. This is our job. We can get this done. I think we are quite close now with similar structures and having gone through various iterations during the select committee process a year and a half ago. Let's do the right thing. Let's act now.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a pe-

riod of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. SENATE INTERNS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this summer, it was my privilege to select several talented young Kentuckians for an internship in my Washington Senate office. As a former Senate intern myself, I am proud of the individuals who are eager to apply themselves to public service.

I would like to take a moment to commend James Adams of Jefferson County, William Cohen of Jefferson County, Julian Colvin of Jefferson County, Garland Ellis of Bell County, Mary Grace Furnish of Harrison County, William Miller of Taylor County, Lauren Reuss of Spencer County, Samuel Rickert of Oldham County, Elizabeth Rupp of Fayette County, Madelin Shelton of Owen County, Victoria Sisk of Christian County, Jordan White of Campbell County, and Erdin Zukic of Warren County for their interest in serving the Commonwealth of Kentucky and our great Nation. Each of these young people has developed an impressive list of leadership experiences and extracurricular activities. Their applications stood out, and I was proud to offer them an internship.

Unfortunately, the coronavirus crisis forced the cancellation of this summer's internship program. The virus may have taken away this opportunity, but it can never change the great potential these Kentuckians have in store. I would like to thank each of them for pursuing public service and to extend my best wishes for a bright future.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. SENATE PAGES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it was my privilege to select three outstanding high school students from Kentucky for this summer's U.S. Senate Page Program. These talented young people completed a highly competitive application process, and they represent the next generation of Kentucky's leaders.

I would like to take a moment to commend Jackson Hester, Charlotte McCarthy, and Thomas Schrepferman for their interest in serving the Commonwealth of Kentucky and our great Nation. Their applications showed a broad range of leadership experiences and extracurricular activities. These Kentuckians and their families should be proud of all they've accomplished at this young age.

Unfortunately, the coronavirus crisis made it impossible for the Senate Page Program to bring these students to Washington this summer. The virus may have canceled this opportunity, but it can never change the great potential these young people have in store. I would like to thank Jackson, Charlotte, and Thomas for their com-

mitment to public service and extend my best wishes for a bright future.

NOMINATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, workers right now are dealing with unprecedented challenges and are making great personal sacrifices to keep the country running during this crisis.

And the nominees under consideration today for the National Labor Relations Board will play a critical role in safeguarding their rights and protections.

That is why I voted for Lauren McFerran to serve another term on the NLRB.

She is a dedicated, qualified, and well-respected public servant who had a proven track record of fighting for workers before she joined the Board and has stood by workers in enforcing these fundamental protections during her time on the NLRB.

But unfortunately, the opposite is true for Marvin Kaplan, the Republican nominee to the NLRB.

Mr. Kaplan spent his career working to further corporations' interests and gut workers' rights instead of protecting them. That is why Democrats opposed his nomination in 2017, and that is exactly what he has done since joining the NLRB.

He is exactly wrong to serve another term on the NLRB, and that is why I voted against his confirmation.

I am also extremely disappointed we do not have the nomination of another highly qualified Democrat to the NLRB, Jennifer Abruzzo, to consider today.

Years of Republican obstruction of highly qualified Democratic nominees to critical worker protection agencies like the NLRB and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shows a blatant disregard for longstanding deference to the minority party and is a significant departure from the customs of this institution. It is unacceptable, and I will not stop pushing for Democratic nominees.

I urge my colleagues to vote today to stand up for workers and their rights.

I would also like to say that, after months of delay from my Republican colleagues, the COVID relief proposal Republicans put forward this week is incredibly late, profoundly inadequate, and can't credibly be considered a starting point for negotiations.

It gives corporations a "get out of jail free" card to prevent employers from being held accountable for keeping their workers safe and a license to discriminate including on the basis of age, race, sex, and disability status.

And instead of expanding unemployment benefits that have been a lifeline for workers in my home State and across the country—which by the way, are due to expire tomorrow—Republicans have slashed them.

This bill doesn't get us anywhere near where we need to be on developing a vaccine that is accessible and affordable to every person and is completely

inadequate in addressing our testing and contract tracing shortfalls.

And while Democrats want schools to reopen for in-person learning if it can be done safely, the partisan Republican proposal would put students, educators, and communities at risk.

Republicans need to abandon this dangerous one-size-fits all approach to reopening schools in-person and pass our Child Care Education and Relief Act, which would provide \$430 billion to address the national child care and education crises during this pandemic.

My question to Republican leaders is why, when things are already so hard, are you determined to make them harder for people who are already struggling so much?

It is shameful, and we are going to keep calling you to account for it until workers, families, and communities get the support they need.

Thank you.

IDB PRESIDENCY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the campaign currently underway to select the next president of the Inter-American Development Bank in September of this year.

The IDB has served as the pre-eminent development bank in the Americas since 1959. For more than six decades, it has brought together the United States, Canada, and our partners from Latin America and the Caribbean to advance an agenda for development and inclusive economic growth in our hemisphere. The United States has proudly been a leading voice to strengthen the IDB's critical mission in the Americas, and donors from the European Union to Japan and South Korea, have provided enduring support to the institution.

In September, the IDB will hold elections to select its next president. Last month, the United States announced it would nominate Mauricio Claver Carone, the current National Security Council senior director for the Western Hemisphere, as our candidate to be the next president of the IDB. Since Mr. Claver Carone's nomination was announced, more than 15 governments in the region have offered their support for his candidacy. These governments represent a wide range of ideological perspectives, levels of economic development, and different historic relationships with the IDB. In recent weeks, the Secretary General of the Organization of American States, our hemisphere's other premier multilateral institution, offered words of support for Mr. Claver Carone's candidacy.

I have known Mr. Claver Carone for over two decades. During this time, Mr. Claver Carone has demonstrated a commitment to inclusive economic development in Latin America and the Caribbean, and he has been an outspoken advocate for democracy and human rights in our hemisphere. In his more recent roles at the National Security

Council, the International Monetary Fund, and the Treasury Department, he has worked with governments across the region and across the ideological spectrum to advance United States' partnerships in the Americas. He has also worked to address the political, economic, and humanitarian crisis in Venezuela, and counter the agendas of governments that seek to counter U.S. interests in the region, from Cuba's authoritarian regime to Putin's Russia to China's Government. Of equal importance, he has shown the ability to work in a bipartisan manner with Democrats and Republicans in the United States, including in the U.S. Congress.

While I have been and remain an ardent critic of many aspects of the Trump administration's foreign policy towards Latin America and the Caribbean and I have not always agreed with every policy decision that Mr. Claver Carone has made during his service to our government, I recognize his consistent commitment to advancing U.S. national security, our foreign policy interests, and an agenda of shared priorities with our partners in the hemisphere.

For these reasons, I support Mr. Claver Carone's candidacy and would welcome the opportunity to continue working with him as the next president of the Inter-American Development Bank.

I recognize that selection of the next IDB president is taking place 2 months before the United States holds general elections and that some have concerns about the implications of this timing. Given that the United States is the IDB's largest shareholder, the next IDB president must commit to working in a bipartisan manner with the next U.S. President and their administration, regardless of party. This is an essential task for the success of the IDB. As the senior Democrat in the Foreign Relations Committee, I would look forward to working with Mr. Claver Carone to ensure that this happens.

As COVID-19 continues to spread across the Americas and severe economic impacts follow, the IDB will play an absolutely essential role in the recovery of countries across the region. This makes the selection of the IDB's next president of the utmost importance. The IDB needs leadership that can achieve consensus across the Western hemisphere and set the stage for a decade-long recovery effort. The task is formidable, but I remain confident that the United States can and will play an integral part in supporting the IDB's efforts and our partners in the region.

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADMIRAL MICHAEL SCOTT SCIRETTA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I honor a superb leader, liaison, and warrior. After 3 years of service as director of the Navy Senate Liaison Office, RDML Scott Sciretta recently pro-

moted from captain to rear admiral, lower half. On this occasion, I believe it is fitting to recognize Rear Admiral Sciretta's distinguished service and dedication to fostering the relationship between the U.S. Navy and this Chamber.

Rear Admiral Sciretta is a 1992 graduate of the Pennsylvania State University. A surface warfare officer by designation, Rear Admiral Sciretta has led our Nation's young men and women on shore and at sea, most prominently in command of USS *Jason Dunham*, USS *Cowpens*, and USS *Lake Erie*. The Navy has consistently relied upon Rear Admiral Sciretta for his exceptional leadership and unparalleled work ethic.

Rear Admiral Sciretta has excelled in numerous other leadership positions in the Navy, most recently as the director, Navy Senate Liaison. In the Russell Senate Office Building and around the globe, Rear Admiral Sciretta filled the role that was initially created and held by Senator John McCain after his return from Vietnam as a Navy captain. Decades later, Rear Admiral Sciretta had the job of coordinating a weeklong series of logistical movements around the country that enabled present and former Members of both Chambers to honor a late colleague and dear friend.

Over the course of the last few years, Rear Admiral Sciretta led 45 congressional delegations to 35 different countries. He escorted over half of the Members of this Chamber on travel and became a trusted adviser and friend to many of us. I have had the pleasure of traveling with Rear Admiral Sciretta on a number of trips. He distinguished himself by going above and beyond the call of duty to facilitate and successfully execute each and every trip, despite any number of weather, aircraft, and diplomatic complications.

Recently, Rear Admiral Sciretta departed Washington for Key West, FL, to serve as the deputy director of Joint Interagency Task Force South and lead operations to combat illicit trafficking. This Chamber will feel Rear Admiral Sciretta's absence. I join many past and present Members of Congress in my gratitude and appreciation to Rear Admiral Sciretta for his outstanding leadership and unwavering support of the missions of the U.S. Navy. I especially recognize his patient and supportive family, Mrs. Sharon Diane Sciretta, Navy Lieutenant James Francis Sciretta and his wife, Ms. Delma Eylin Sciretta, and Navy Midshipman Adam Joseph Sciretta. I wish this Navy family "fair winds and following seas."

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN RUAIRIDH MORRISON

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Dr. John Ruairidh "Ru" Morrison, chief of Clan Morrison, as he steps down from his position as the founding executive director of the Northeast Regional Association of

Coastal Ocean Observing Systems, NERACOOS. During his 10 years at NERACOOS, Dr. Morrison has been a visionary in the world of ocean observing for the people of New Hampshire, the Northeast, and this country. I know I speak for so many others when I say that we are deeply grateful and thank him for his service.

Originally from Scotland, Ru became a true advocate for New Hampshire when he began his position as an assistant research professor at the University of New Hampshire in 2003. During his tenure at UNH, Ru was an inspirational teacher whose work advanced the science of remote sensing. A primary focus of his efforts centered on building a better understanding of Great Bay, a resource that many in New Hampshire consider to be a cornerstone of our coastal environment.

When Ru transitioned to NERACOOS in 2009, he brought with him his extensive knowledge of marine science and technology, the coastal and ocean environment, and, most importantly, his collaborative nature, which was instrumental in establishing a successful regional ocean observing system. NERACOOS, 1 of 11 regional associations of the U.S. Integrated Ocean Observing System—IOOS—addresses the ocean monitoring and forecasting needs of the people of the Northeast.

As executive director of NERACOOS, Ru's charisma and outgoing nature, coupled with his ocean science expertise, allowed him to bring together scientists, resource managers, fishermen, NGOs, and the public into a system notable for its esprit de corps. My staff and I all have many fond memories of joining him for boat rides on Great Bay to get a firsthand look at NERACOOS's work on the estuary. Anyone who's worked with Ru can attest to his warmth, wit, and self-deprecating sense of humor, which made working with him and NERACOOS a real pleasure.

Over the past decade, Ru has grown the organization's prominence and expanded collaborations among its many users. Even more impactful, though, is a decade's worth of Ru's infectious enthusiasm, which invigorated the organization and its stakeholders alike. Under Ru's stewardship, NERACOOS became a morning ritual for fishermen preparing for their day at sea, and with the formation of the Northeast Coastal Acidification Network—NECAN—NERACOOS has become a national leader in facilitating regional responses to changing ocean chemistry.

Ru's influence extends far beyond his backyard. He is the past chair of the IOOS Association; a member of the IOOS Federal Advisory Committee; councilor of the bi-national Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment; board director of the Marine and Oceanography Technology Network; and science advisory board member for the Lake George Jefferson Project. I was pleased to invite him to Capitol Hill in 2016 to testify before the Senate Democratic Steering and Outreach

Committee to share his expertise with Congress. I and my staff are greatly indebted to him for all of his advice and counsel over the years. It is truly difficult to overstate the breadth and significance of his service.

Ru would be the first to say that the foundation of his success is his family: his wife Ann Michelle and their children, Alistair and Marin. I know that everyone at NERACOOS and throughout the ocean observing community joins me in thanking Dr. Morrison and his family for his instrumental leadership and vision. We wish him all the best in retirement.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL JOSEPH D. WALL

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a great American and an exceptional member of the U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Col. Joseph "Joe" Wall has distinguished himself through his professional character and dedication by serving this Nation in uniform. A leader and expert communicator, he has provided distinguished service to our country while assigned to the Air Force Senate Liaison Office. He is an outstanding leader and has been the perfect airman to represent the Air Force on Capitol Hill. Joe is a command pilot with more than 3,000 hours in the T-37B, T-1A, and KC-10A aircraft with over 100 combat and combat support missions, supporting operations over Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, and the Horn of Africa.

Throughout his career, Joe has demonstrated his exceptional abilities; he was a ROTC distinguished graduate at the University of Miami, graduate of the Air Mobility Command Phoenix Mobility program, and he is an Olmsted Scholar fluent in German. Prior to his current assignment, Joe had the privilege of leading airmen as a squadron commander for the 79th Air Refueling Squadron at Travis Air Force Base. As a legislative liaison in the Air Force Senate Liaison Office from June 2018 to July 2020, Lieutenant Colonel Wall performed his duties well and without reservation. His strategic thinking and foresight helped to strengthen and improve our national security. Joe accomplished this utilizing his in-depth Air Force knowledge with numerous engagements between Congress and the Department of the Air Force.

During this assignment, Joe conducted congressional engagements to provide Members of Congress and staff insights into the development of the "Air Force We Need" plan required to support the National Defense Strategy. He also actively engaged Members of Congress regarding the fielding and production of the KC-46A Pegasus Tanker. Last year, Joe led the effort to make sure that the New Hampshire Congressional Delegation was front and center to receive the first KC-46A at Pease Air National Guard Base.

Joe organized dozens of direct engagements between senior leaders at the Department of the Air Force and Members of Congress in order to convey important information on behalf of the Air Force. All of these conversations and engagements helped stakeholders understand the defense equities and the impact on national security. Due to his direct involvement, Members of Congress were able to make informed decisions and ensure the Department of the Air Force was properly resourced.

After serving in this important role for the past 2 years, Lieutenant Colonel Wall will move to his next assignment, the Dwight D. Eisenhower School at the National Defense University. Joe, his wife Trysta, and their son Tavin have sacrificed much as a family in service to our Nation. I am thankful for Joe's service and his work with my office and the Senate over the past 2 years on issues important to the State of New Hampshire and this great Nation. I salute him, an American patriot whose service has kept our country safe and strong. Thank you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING HYDRA ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION, LLC

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit at the heart of our country. It is my privilege to recognize a woman-owned small business known for its excellence in industry and environmental stewardship. This week, it is my pleasure to honor Hydra Engineering and Construction, LLC, of Crawfordville, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 2008, Leslie Hope established Hydra Engineering after she left her position as a partner in an engineering firm to pursue her dream of being a small business owner. After graduating from the University of South Florida, Leslie started planning how to open her own engineering company. Leslie turned to her local Small Business Development Center where she enrolled Hydra Engineering in the U.S. Small Business Administration's 8(a) business development program. This program provides resources, mentorship, and training to help small businesses owned by socially and economically disadvantaged persons compete for government contracts.

Over the next 12 years, Leslie rebranded her enterprise as Hydra Engineering and Construction to reflect its growth and expansion. She completed the 8(a) program, was certified by the State of Florida as a Minority Business Enterprise and as a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise by the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Hydra Engineering has worked for several Florida private companies and

agencies, including the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. They have completed projects in 16 other States, working for the National Park Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Forest Service.

For their entrepreneurship, innovation and environmental stewardship, Hydra Engineering has been recognized by local, State, and industry organizations. In 2018, they were nominated as a GrowFL Florida Company to Watch, recognizing their status as a Floridian second-stage company demonstrating high marketplace performance and innovation. As one of the world's fastest growing USF-alumni owned or led businesses, Hydra Engineering earned the USF Fast 56 Award in 2016 and 2018. Additionally, Leslie was nominated as the 2011 SBA North Florida Region Small Business Person of the Year. She also sits on the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University-Florida State University Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering Advisory Board.

Like many small businesses across Florida, Hydra was impacted by the coronavirus pandemic. When the U.S. Small Business Administration launched the Paycheck Protection Program, Leslie applied for funding. The PPP provides forgivable loans to impacted small businesses and nonprofits who maintain their payroll during the COVID-19 pandemic. Thanks to the PPP, Hydra Engineering is able to support its employees, many who work and reside in Wakulla County.

Hydra Engineering and Construction demonstrates how small firms use SBA resources to grow. I applaud their commitment to excellence and unique role in supporting Florida's critical infrastructure.

Congratulations to Leslie and the entire team, I look forward to watching your continued growth and success in Florida.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13441 OF AUGUST 1, 2007, WITH RESPECT TO LEBANON—PM 57

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Lebanon declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007, is to continue in effect beyond August 1, 2020.

Certain ongoing activities, such as Iran's continuing arms transfers to Hizballah—which include increasingly sophisticated weapons systems—serve to undermine Lebanese sovereignty, contribute to political and economic instability in the region, and continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 29, 2020.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:07 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2163. An act to establish the Commission on the Social Status of Black Men and Boys, to study and make recommendations to address social problems affecting Black men and boys, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2420. An act to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 4.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2420. An act to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-217. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to remove the revenue sharing cap on the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act (GOMESA) of 2006 for Gulf producing states and to take such actions as are necessary to rectify the federal revenue sharing inequities between coastal and interior energy producing states; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 11

Whereas, many of the energy resources enjoyed by the entire United States are dependent upon the health of Gulf Coast ecosystems which provide access to those resources and related infrastructure and protection for communities that house its workforce; and

Whereas, Louisiana is home to thirty percent of the nation's wetlands and ninety percent of its wetlands loss, a crisis that impacts communities, ecosystems, and the very economic engines that contribute to the nation's energy security; and

Whereas, under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920, fifty percent of the mineral revenues generated from federal lands onshore are shared with the host state to offset impacts of the federal mineral development; this includes royalties, severance taxes, and bonuses, all under no cap; and

Whereas, under GOMESA, Gulf producing states, including Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, share only thirty-seven and one half percent of the mineral revenues generated by oil and gas production from active leases since 2006 in federal waters and the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS); and

Whereas, currently annual GOMESA revenues for Gulf producing states are capped at three hundred seventy-five million dollars per year, apportioned to the mineral activity supported by each Gulf state; and

Whereas, according to the most recent data from the United States Energy Information Administration (EIA), Louisiana, within its territorial boundaries, is the ninth largest producer of oil in the United States, but it is the second largest oil producer in the country if oil production from adjacent federal waters is included; and

Whereas, according to the most recent data from the EIA, Louisiana, within its territorial boundaries, is the fourth largest producer of gas in the United States, but it is the second largest gas producer in the country if gas production from adjacent federal waters is included; and

Whereas, Louisiana contributes to the United States Strategic Petroleum Reserve with two facilities located in the state consisting of twenty-nine caverns capable of holding nearly three hundred million barrels of crude oil; and

Whereas, with a number of onshore liquefied natural gas (LNG) facilities and others

already permitted, more LNG facilities than any other state in the country, and the Louisiana Offshore Oil Port, the nation's only deepwater oil port, Louisiana plays an essential role in the movement of natural gas and crude oil from the United States Gulf Coast region to markets throughout the country and the world; and

Whereas, the majority of the oil and gas production from the Gulf of Mexico enters the United States through coastal Louisiana with all of the infrastructure necessary to receive and transport such production; and

Whereas, because Louisiana is losing more coastal wetlands than any other state in the country, in 2006 the people of Louisiana overwhelmingly approved a constitutional amendment dedicating revenues received from OCS oil and gas activity through GOMESA to the Coastal Protection and Restoration Fund for the purposes of coastal protection, including conservation, coastal restoration, hurricane protection, and infrastructure directly impacted by coastal wetland losses; and

Whereas, the state of Louisiana has developed, through a science-based and stakeholder-involved process, a "Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast" which identifies and prioritizes the most efficient and effective projects in order to meet the state's critical coastal protection and restoration needs and has received many accolades from the country's scientific community; and

Whereas, the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority is making great progress implementing the projects contained in the "Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast" with all available funding, projects that are essential to the protection of the infrastructure that is critical to the energy needs of the United States; and

Whereas, for the state of Louisiana and our coastal parishes, the GOMESA revenue stream is a critical recurring source of revenue that allows our state and coastal parishes to address our coastal protection and restoration needs to support our working coast. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to remove the revenue sharing cap on the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 for Gulf producing states and to take such actions as are necessary to rectify the federal revenue sharing inequities between coastal and interior energy producing states.

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-218. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to take such actions as are necessary to clarify and provide guidance regarding the ability of freshwater fisherman or fishery-related businesses affected by the COVID-19 pandemic to receive assistance funding from CARES Act dollars; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 16

Whereas, three hundred million dollars in fisheries assistance funding has been provided by Section 12005 of the federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act; and

Whereas, the United States Secretary of Commerce, through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries,

has allocated fourteen million seven hundred eighty-five thousand two hundred forty-four dollars with the specific purpose of assisting Louisiana commercial fishermen, charter businesses, qualified aquaculture operations, subsistence users, processors, and other fishery-related businesses affected by the COVID-19 pandemic through direct aid payments; and

Whereas, the United States Department of Commerce's determination has limited qualified applicants to those who participate in various sectors of coastal and marine fisheries, thereby precluding eligibility for freshwater fisheries; and

Whereas, Louisiana has thousands of commercially licensed freshwater fishermen; and Whereas, in 2019 the freshwater fisheries harvest, including wild caught crawfish, accounted for a dockside value of nearly twenty million dollars, illustrating how vital freshwater fisheries are to the people and the economy of Louisiana; and

Whereas, the full scale of the economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on freshwater fisheries has not yet been determined; however, these fisheries have been directly impacted; and

Whereas, the impacts to freshwater fisheries and other Louisiana fisheries participants result in individuals who would benefit greatly from a direct payment program; and

Whereas, the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries is charged with developing programs to expend these funds; and

Whereas, the Legislature of Louisiana supports the development of direct payment programs to industry participants: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to take such actions as are necessary to clarify and provide guidance regarding the ability of freshwater fishermen or fishery-related businesses affected by the COVID-19 pandemic to receive assistance funding from CARES Act dollars; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-219. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to extend certifications for an 8(a) business by one additional year if the business was certified by January 1, 2020; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 22

Whereas, the 8(a) Business Development Program (program) is a business assistance program that exists to level the playing field for small businesses owned by socially and economically disadvantaged people or entities; and

Whereas, the program offers a broad scope of assistance to businesses that are at least fifty-one percent owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals whose personal net worth is two hundred fifty thousand dollars or less, and who own four million dollars or less in assets; and

Whereas, the 8(a) program is an essential instrument for helping socially and economically disadvantaged entrepreneurs gain access to the economic mainstream or American society and helps thousands of aspiring entrepreneurs to gain a foothold in government contracting; and

Whereas, beginning as early as March 11, 2020, many states declared a public health emergency as a result of the imminent

threat posed by the outbreak of a respiratory disease caused by a novel coronavirus known commonly as COVID-19; and

Whereas, the Centers for Disease Control suggested aggressive measures for limiting the possible interaction of the public with individuals who are exposed to or test positive for the virus; and

Whereas, the response by many states to the contagion of COVID-19 required a large scale disruption of the state economies as many businesses were closed in order to protect the public health and to prevent a spike in demand for health care services that would have overwhelmed the capacity of the health care system to provide services; and

Whereas, a participant in the certified 8(a) Business Development Program receives a program term of nine years from the date of the Small Business Administration's approval letter certifying admission to the program, including four years in the developmental stage and five years in the transitional stage; and

Whereas, efforts to slow or disrupt the spread of COVID-19 has resulted in the temporary closure of many 8(a) certified businesses; and

Whereas, temporary closures of 8(a) certified businesses may have prevented these businesses from reaching the program goal of maintaining a balance between their commercial and government business, and this may result in poor performance reviews, incomplete business planning, and unfair evaluations due to the unforeseen and unavoidable consequences of COVID-19: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to extend certifications for 8(a) businesses for one additional year beyond the requisite nine-year term, thereby allowing those 8(a) certified businesses that are in the first four years of certification to remain in the developmental stage an additional year if the business was certified before January 1, 2020, and similarly, the 8(a) certified businesses currently in the five-year transitional stage would be extended by one additional year; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-220. A joint resolution adopted by the legislature of the State of Colorado urging the Department of Defense to permanently base the United States Space Command (USSPACECOM) in Colorado; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 20-018

Whereas, Our nation and the world have significantly benefitted from technological and scientific advances resulting from space exploration and aerospace activities, and Colorado is paving the way for new discoveries in the frontiers of space by having a rich history in aerospace development and being at the forefront of space travel, exploration, and aerospace research; and

Whereas, Colorado is ranked number one in the country for aerospace employment with a strategically located aerospace center of excellence with over 30,000 Coloradans directly employed in aerospace and a payroll exceeding \$3.9 billion; an aerospace cluster that supports more than 190,000 jobs; and 7.5 percent of Colorado's labor income derived from Department of Defense (DoD) employment, and 6.5 percent of the state's gross state product that is DoD-related; and

Whereas, Colorado is a leader for business growth, with the number one economy in the

country in 2019 according to the U.S. News & World Report and ranked fourth in high-tech employment and fourth on the State Technology and Science Index, supporting Colorado's position as a top aerospace state economy and workforce; and

Whereas, Colorado's aerospace industry is home to a broad range of companies that create products and systems for commercial, military, and civil space applications, such as spacecraft, launch vehicles, satellites, command and control software, sensors, and navigation operations. These companies include Ball Aerospace, Boeing, DigitalGlobe, Harris Corporation, Lockheed Martin Space Systems, Northrop Grumman, Raytheon, Sierra Nevada Corporation, Teledyne Brown Engineering, and United Launch Alliance, which make up the aerospace sector; and

Whereas, Colorado is uniting global partners around the world to ensure space access for developing nations via the first planned United Nations space mission. Sierra Nevada Corporation, located in Louisville, Colorado, together with the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs, will use its Dream Chaser spacecraft to allow developing countries the opportunity to develop and fly micro-gravity payloads for an extended duration in orbit; and

Whereas, Colorado has an existing educated workforce, ranked second in the nation with residents with a bachelor's degree or higher, and a pipeline of higher institutions to sustain future growth. We are home to the United States Air Force Academy and many colleges and universities, including the University of Colorado Boulder and the University of Colorado Colorado Springs, Colorado School of Mines, Colorado State University, Metropolitan State University of Denver, University of Denver, Colorado Mesa University, and Fort Lewis College. Altogether, they provide access to world-class aerospace-related degrees and offer aerospace companies one of the country's most educated workforces; and

Whereas, Colorado is home to some of the most prestigious research institutions, such as the Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics (LASP) at the University of Colorado Boulder. It began in 1948, a decade before NASA, and is the world's only research institute to have sent instruments to all eight planets and to Pluto, combining all aspects of space exploration through science, engineering, mission operations, and scientific data analysis; and

Whereas, Colorado is also home to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Space Weather Prediction Center, a world-leading center of predictions of the solar and near-Earth space environment and the nation's official source of watches, warnings, and alerts of incoming solar storms, using satellite observations to protect and save lives and property; and

Whereas, Colorado is strategically located at the center of our national and space defense. We are the home to five key strategic military commands: North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM), United States Strategic Command's Joint Functional Component Command for Space (JFCC Space) Missile Warning Center, the United States Air Force Space Command, and the United States Army Space and Missile Defense Command/Army Forces Strategic Command; and five military installations, including United States Air Force bases Buckley, Cheyenne Mountain, Peterson, and Schriever and Fort Carson Army base; and

Whereas, The 460th Space Wing at Buckley Air Force Base provides operational command and control of three constellations of space-based infrared missile warning sys-

tems, has been defending America continuously since 1970, and is a critical part of global defense and national security; and

Whereas, Colorado is already the center for United States military space operations and strategy. According to the Colorado Space Coalition (CSC), the state's military commands are the primary customers for space-based research, development, acquisitions, and operations, representing nearly 90 percent of space-related expenditure by the military. Moving the United States Space Command to any other location than Colorado will be incredibly disruptive to the National Defense Strategy. In addition, it will cause a major upheaval in existing infrastructure and jobs in the state, which will result in higher costs and less efficient outcomes for the United States military; and

Whereas, Colorado leads the charge in bringing current and future global positioning system (GPS) assets to life, a service provided free to the world by Air Force Space Command in Colorado Springs. From the operation of GPS satellites by Schriever Air Force Base to GPS III, the most powerful GPS satellite to date being designed and built by Lockheed Martin and launched by United Launch Alliance with Raytheon developing the command and control capabilities, and with companies such as Boeing, Harris Corporation, Braxton Technologies, and Infinity Systems Engineering also supporting GPS development and operations from locations in Colorado, our GPS technologies enable an integral part of our global economy to have an incalculable impact that has improved the everyday lives of billions of people around the world; and

Whereas, Various organizations are key to Colorado's prominence in aerospace, such as the Colorado Space Coalition, a group of industry stakeholders working to make Colorado a center of excellence for aerospace; the Colorado Space Business Roundtable, working to bring together aerospace stakeholders from the industry, government, and academia for roundtable discussions and business development and to encourage grassroots citizen participation in aerospace issues; the Colorado chapter of Citizens for Space Exploration, whose mission is to promote better understanding of aerospace and its importance in our economy and daily lives, as well as to promote the importance of human space exploration; Manufacturer's Edge, a statewide manufacturing assistance center that encourages the strength and competitiveness of Colorado manufacturers by providing on-site technical assistance through coaching, training, and consulting, by providing collaboration-focused industry programs, and by leveraging government, university, and economic development partnerships; and the Space Foundation, founded in 1983, with its world headquarters in Colorado Springs, Colorado, which holds an annual Space Symposium, bringing together civil, commercial, and national security space leaders from around the world to discuss, address, and plan for the future of space; Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Seventy-second General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:

That we, the members of the Colorado General Assembly:

(1) Recognizing Colorado's unique blend of military installations and major commands, private aerospace companies, academic and research institutions, and government entities, and the valuable synergies this ecosystem produces, strongly urge the Department of Defense to keep the existing United States Space Combatant Command in Colorado;

(2) Furthermore, we strongly urge the Department of Defense to permanently base the

United States Space Command (USSPACECOM) in Colorado, recognizing that Colorado provides the existing command structure, base infrastructure, and communications platforms necessary to successfully host additional national security initiatives and ensure coordination of efforts without committing restrictive additional funds;

(3) Proudly express that Colorado has deep ties with the Department of Defense and immense patriotic commitment to providing for the nation's security and bolstering our defense;

(4) Express our most sincere and deepest appreciation to our service members and civilian employees working in and supporting military and civilian aerospace companies, military installations, and civil organizations in Colorado; and

(5) Hereby declare Colorado to be the prime location for USSPACECOM; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Joint Resolution be sent to President Donald J. Trump; Vice President Michael R. Pence; House Speaker Nancy Pelosi; House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy; Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell; Senate Minority Leader Charles E. Schumer; Senator Michael Bennet; Senator Cory Gardner; Congresswoman Diana DeGette; Congressman Joe Neguse; Congressman Scott Tipton; Congressman Ken Buck; Congressman Doug Lamborn; Congressman Jason Crow; Congressman Ed Perlmutter; Jim Bridenstine, NASA Administrator; James W. Morhard, NASA Deputy Administrator; Steve Dickson, Federal Aviation Administration Administrator; Governor Jared Polis; Lieutenant Governor Dianne Primavera; Major General Michael A. Loh, The Adjutant General, Colorado National Guard; Wayne R. Monteith, Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation at the Federal Aviation Administration; General John W. "Jay" Raymond, Air Force Space Commander; Colonel Jacob Middleton, USAF, Commander Aerospace Data Facility-Colorado; Betty Sapp, Director, National Reconnaissance Office; Ross Garelick Bell, Executive Director, Aerospace States Association; Thomas E. Zelibor, Chief Executive Officer, Space Foundation; Dr. Ronald Sega, Co-chair, Colorado Space Coalition; Michael Gass, Co-chair, Colorado Space Coalition; and Stacey DeFore, Chair, Colorado Citizens Space Exploration.

POM-221. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Colorado strongly urging and requesting the government of the United States of America to take action to preserve and enhance United States leadership in space, and declaring March 10, 2020, "Colorado Aerospace Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 20-004

Whereas, Our nation and the world have significantly benefitted from technological and scientific advances resulting from space exploration and aerospace activities; and

Whereas, Colorado is the number one state per capita in the country for private aerospace employment; and

Whereas, There are 30,020 Coloradans who are directly employed in aerospace, with the aerospace cluster supporting nearly 200,000 jobs; and

Whereas, Colorado is home to the nation's top aerospace companies, including Ball Aerospace, Boeing, L3Harris, Lockheed Martin Space, Maxar Technologies, Northrop Grumman, Raytheon, Sierra Nevada Corporation, Teledyne Brown Engineering, and United Launch Alliance, and close to 500 additional companies that support the aerospace sector by providing services and developing products, including spacecraft, launch

vehicles, satellites, command and control software, sensors, and navigation operations; and

Whereas, Colorado is a strategic location for national space and cyber activity, with five key military commands—North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), the United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM), the United States Strategic Command's Joint Functional Component Command for Space (JFCC Space) Missile Warning Center, the United States Space Command, and the United States Army Space and Missile Defense Command/Army Forces Strategic Command—and three space-related United States Air Force bases—Buckley, Peterson, and Schriever; and

Whereas, The United States Air Force Academy, along with Colorado's colleges and universities, including the University of Colorado Boulder, University of Colorado Colorado Springs, Colorado School of Mines, Colorado State University, Metropolitan State University of Denver, University of Denver, Colorado Mesa University, and Fort Lewis College provides access to world-class aerospace-related degrees and offers aerospace companies one of the country's most educated workforces; and

Whereas, Various organizations are key to Colorado's prominence in aerospace, such as the Colorado Space Coalition, a group of industry stakeholders working to grow and promote Colorado as a center of excellence for aerospace, and the Colorado Space Business Roundtable, an organization that works to convene stakeholders from industry, government, and academia to advance aerospace business and workforce opportunities throughout the state, that together form the Colorado chapter of the Aerospace States Association, a nonpartisan organization of Lieutenant Governors and associate members from aerospace organizations and academia who represent states' interests in federal aerospace and aviation policy development; the Colorado chapter of Citizens for Space Exploration, in partnership with the Colorado Space Business Roundtable, whose mission is to promote better understanding of aerospace and its importance in our economy and daily lives as well as promoting the importance of human space exploration; and Manufacturer's Edge, a statewide manufacturing assistance center that encourages the strength and competitiveness of Colorado manufacturers by providing on-site technical assistance through coaching, training, and consulting and collaboration-focused industry programs and leveraging government, university, and economic development partnerships; and

Whereas, The Colorado Air and Space Port seeks to serve as America's hub for commercial space transportation, research, and development and this horizontal launch facility will have the potential to become the foundation for a global suborbital transportation network connecting Colorado globally; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Seventy-second General Assembly of the State of Colorado:

That we, the members of the Colorado Senate:

(1) Strongly urge and request the government of the United States of America to take action to preserve and enhance United States leadership in space, spur innovation, and ensure our continued national and economic security by increasing funding for space exploration and activities, including regaining the ability of the United States to deliver astronauts to low Earth orbit in the next few years and to commit to and aggressively pursue sending the first woman and United States astronauts to the Moon by 2024 under the Artemis program with a goal of

sending a crewed mission to orbit Mars by 2033 using the Orion spacecraft and the Space Launch System to get there;

(2) Recognize and appreciate Colorado's space and aerospace companies and organizations, especially the growing membership and activities of the Colorado chapter of Citizens for Space Exploration, in partnership with the Colorado Space Business Roundtable, whose activities to promote space exploration are helping to increase public understanding and enthusiasm for exploration funding;

(3) Recognize and support our Congressional Delegation in urging the Department of Defense to reestablish the United States Space Command in Colorado;

(4) Recognize and appreciate the contributions of Colorado's universities, colleges, and national research laboratories to the space and aerospace industries, including their expertise in exploration of the planets and the universe and space-based Earth observation;

(5) Express our most sincere and deepest appreciation to the men and women working in our military installations in Colorado; and

(6) Hereby declare March 10, 2020, to be "Colorado Aerospace Day"; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to President Donald Trump; Vice President Mike Pence; Speaker of the House of Representatives Nancy Pelosi; House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy; Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell; Senate Minority Leader Charles Schumer; Senator Cory Gardner; Senator Michael Bennet; Congresswoman Diana DeGette; Congressman Joe Neguse; Congressman Scott Tipton; Congressman Ken Buck; Congressman Doug Lamborn; Congressman Jason Crow; Congressman Ed Perlmutter; Jim Bridenstine, NASA Administrator; Daniel K. Elwell, Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration; Governor Jared Polis; Lieutenant Governor and Co-chair, Colorado Space Coalition, Dianne Primavera; Major General Michael A. Loh, The Adjutant General, Colorado National Guard; General John Raymond, Commander, U.S. Space Command, and Commander, Air Force Space Command; Colonel Devin Pepper, USAF, Commander of the 460th Space Wing, Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado; Dr. Christopher Scales, Director, National Reconnaissance Office; Ross B. Garelick Bell, Executive Director, Aerospace States Association; Thomas E. Zelibor, Chief Executive Officer, Space Foundation; Dr. Ronald M. Sega, Co-chair, Colorado Space Coalition; Michael Gass, Co-chair, Colorado Space Coalition; Alires Almon, Chair, Colorado Space Business Roundtable; Stacey DeFore, Chair, Colorado Citizens for Space Exploration; Dave Ruppel, Director, Colorado Air and Space Port; and Debbie Brown, President, Colorado Space Business Roundtable.

POM-222. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the Congress of the United States to help the state of Michigan, schools, and local governments address revenue shortfalls during the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 124

Whereas, The COVID-19 Pandemic has led to an unprecedented economic crisis in the United States. Governors across the country, including Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer, have ordered non-essential businesses and schools to temporarily close and mandated that residents do not leave their homes, except for specific essential activities, in order to limit the spread of COVID-19 and save lives; and

Whereas, The cost of preventing the spread of COVID-19 and protecting Michigan's citi-

zens has been a dramatic decline in state tax revenue. As businesses are shut down and residents are out of work, the projected revenue from income, sales, and other taxes has dropped precipitously. In Michigan, projected General Fund revenue has been reduced by \$2 billion and projected School Aid Fund revenue has declined by \$1.2 billion for Fiscal Year 2020. Even as businesses re-open and restrictions on movement are lifted, the economic fallout from fighting COVID-19 will remain. Significant budget holes are projected in Fiscal Year 2021; and

Whereas, Local governments and schools are also facing a dire fiscal situation. In addition to falling revenues from property, casino, and local income taxes, the fall in state revenue may necessitate severe cuts to state revenue sharing to local governments. Similarly, the substantial shortfall in School Aid Fund revenue may lead to similar cuts in state funding for local school districts; and

Whereas, While government revenues have declined, the costs of providing some critical public services has increased as a result of the Pandemic. About 14,000 "essential" state employees are eligible for extra pay on each paycheck during the crisis. Several municipalities have enacted hazard pay for employees who are working during the crisis. In Wayne County, sheriff's deputies are receiving an additional \$30 per day worked with additional hazard pay available for overtime shifts; and

Whereas, While Congress has already enacted some federal aid for states and local governments, its limited scope and restrictions will be insufficient to weather the effects of the Pandemic. Michigan is currently expected to receive about \$3.8 billion from the federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, but the funds may only be used for expenses associated with the Pandemic. In addition, since the act only provides direct aid to local governments with a population exceeding 500,000, only a handful of Michigan's nearly 2,000 local units of government will be eligible for direct payments from the federal government; and

Whereas, Increasing the flexibility states have when using CARES Act aid will help mitigate these dramatic cuts. Allowing states and local governments to use CARES Act funding for costs that are not directly associated with the Pandemic will help to address their projected revenue shortfalls. Providing flexibility will ensure aid is available to local governments that were left out of the CARES Act and further address state and local budget shortfalls; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to help the state of Michigan, schools, and local governments address revenue shortfalls during the COVID-19 Pandemic; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-223. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to clarify its position on the legality of marijuana under the Controlled Substances Act of 1970; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 151

Whereas, Despite federal law criminalizing marijuana, many states have exercised their authority to enact marijuana laws that reflect the needs and interests of their citizens.

Currently, the state of Michigan is among a majority of states that have chosen to regulate marijuana under state law; and

Whereas, The federal government's lack of clarity and inconsistency in its interpretation of the legality of marijuana under the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 has created confusion and uncertainty for states legislating marijuana operations. This, in turn, affects law enforcement, banking, taxation, and zoning; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge the Congress of the United States to clarify its position on the legality of marijuana under the Controlled Substances Act of 1970; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-224. A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Syracuse, New York, urging the President of the United States, the Senate, the United States Congress, the Supreme Court Justices, and the Department of Justice (Civil Rights Division) to enforce various sections of the United States Constitution and direct all States to eliminate their unconstitutional use of force policies through federal legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-225. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and the City Council of the City of Hackensack, New Jersey, recognizing June 5, 2020 as National Gun Violence Awareness Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-226. A resolution adopted by the Ypsilanti Community School District Board of Education, Washtenaw County, Michigan, urging the federal government to provide revenue replacement for States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

POM-227. A petition from the Massachusetts Department of Transportation relative to Amtrak's supplemental funding request for fiscal year (FY) 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

POM-228. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to visa issuance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1976. A bill to amend the FAST Act to improve the Federal permitting process, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-241).

S. 3045. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to protect United States critical infrastructure by ensuring that the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency has the legal tools it needs to notify private and public sector entities put at risk by cybersecurity vulnerabilities in the networks and systems that control critical assets of the United States (Rept. No. 116-242).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3332. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the halt in pension payments for Members of Congress sentenced for certain offenses, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-243).

H.R. 4761. An act to ensure U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers, agents, and other personnel have adequate synthetic opioid detection equipment, that the Depart-

ment of Homeland Security has a process to update synthetic opioid detection capability, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-244).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2330. A bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to provide for congressional oversight of the board of directors of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee and to protect amateur athletes from emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-245).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Natalie E. Brown, of Nebraska, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Uganda.

Nominee: Natalie E. Brown.

Post: Uganda.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$50, 10/10/2018, Act Blue; \$250, 8/2/2017, Amy McGrath for Congress.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Betty Ann Brown, None; Eugene C. Brown, Jr.—Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Luvinia A. Brown—Deceased; Eugene C. Brown—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Daryle G. Brown, None.

Sandra E. Clark, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Burkina Faso.

Nominee: Sandra Eliane Clark

Post: Burkina Faso

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: Not applicable.

2. Spouse: Not applicable.

3. Children and Spouses: Emma Tolerton: \$600, 7/29/2018, Act Blue DCCC.

4. Parents: Leslie and Simone Clark—Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Leon and Genevieve Clark—Deceased; Victor and Eliane Bleuzé—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Greg and Lisa Clark: None David Clark: \$100, 2017 or 2018, Rep. Cheri Bustos; \$100, 5/20/2019, Act Blue Joe Biden; \$25, 6/29/2019, Act Blue Joe Biden; \$1000, 8/16/2019, Biden for President.

7. Sisters and Spouses: I have no sisters.

Joseph Manso, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as United States Representative to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

Nominee: Joseph Manso.

Post: OPCW.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Lauren Marisa: None.

4. Parents: Jose (deceased); Mary: None.

5. Grandparents (all deceased): Juan; Maria; Antonio; Maria: None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: John: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

Henry T. Wooster, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

Nominee: Henry T. Wooster.

Post: Amman, Jordan.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None, N/A, N/A.

2. Laura L. Dallman: \$100.00, 12/21/2017, ACTBLUE.

3. Children and Spouses: Cameron D. Wooster: None, N/A, N/A; Claire D. Wooster: None, N/A, N/A; Kimberly D. Wooster: None, N/A, N/A; Kristin D. Wooster: None, N/A, N/A.

4. Parents: Henry W. Wooster: None, N/A, N/A; Parida K. Wooster: None, N/A, N/A.

5. Grandparents: Oscar Wooster: Deceased; Florence Hall Wooster: Deceased; Sergei Kakovitch: Deceased; Sonia Kakovitch: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

Jason Myung-lk Chung, of Virginia, to be United States Director of the Asian Development Bank, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Jason Myung lk Chung.

Post: U.S. Director to the Asian Development Bank with the Rank of Ambassador.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: See Attached.

2. Susannah L. Chung (Spouse): None; Davis L. Chung (Son): None; Alexander J. Chung (Son): None.

3. Taesun Park Chung (Mother): See attached; Kun Young Chung (Father): None.

4. Shin Bok Oh Chung (Grandmother): None; Jonnmin Chung (Grandfather—Deceased).

5. Joseph S. Chung (Brother): None; John K. and Kristen Chung (Brother and Sister in Law): None.

ATTACHMENT

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: \$50.00, 10/03/2017, Republican National Committee (RNC); \$50.00, 09/05/2017, RNC; \$50.00, 08/02/2017, RNC; \$50.00, 07/05/2017, RNC; \$50.00, 06/02/2017, RNC; \$250.00, 01/25/2017, Cobb for Congress; \$160.00, 12/13/2016, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc; \$50.00, 12/02/2016, RNC; \$50.00, 11/02/2016, RNC; \$606.50, 09/29/2016,

Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.; \$50.00, 08/02/2016, RNC; \$50.00, 07/05/2016, RNC; \$50.00, 06/02/2016, RNC; \$250.00, 05/27/2015, Republican Party of Virginia (RPV); \$250.00, 10/30/2014, Friends of Dave Brat (VA).

Taesun P. Chung: \$150.00, 08/22/2019, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.; \$200.00, 08/22/2019, Trump Make America Great Again Cmte; \$750.00, 10/22/2018, RNC; \$1000.00, 10/22/2018, Young Kim for Congress (CA); \$500.00, 03/06/2014, Roskam for Congress Committee (IL).

Contributor name, recipient, state, employer, receipt date, amount:

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 10/03/2017, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 09/05/2017, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 08/02/2017, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 07/05/2017, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 06/02/2017, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason, Cobb for Congress, VA, Office of Natl Engagement, 01/25/2017, \$250.00.

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 12/30/2016, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason M., Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., VA, RNC, 12/13/2016, \$160.00.

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 12/02/2016, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 11/02/2016, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 10/04/2016, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., VA, 09/29/2016, \$606.50.

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 08/02/2016, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 07/05/2016, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason M., Republican National Committee, VA, RNC, 06/02/2016, \$50.00.

Chung, Jason M., Republican Party of Virginia Inc., VA, Gateway Consulting, LLC, 05/27/2015, \$250.00.

Chung, Jason M., Friends of Dave Brat Inc., VA, RNC, 10/30/2014, \$250.00.

Chung, Taesun, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., CT, Information Requested per best efforts, 08/22/2019, \$150.00.

Chung, Taesun, Trump Make America Great Again Committee, CT, 08/22/2019, \$200.00.

Chung, Taesun, Republican National Committee, CT, 10/22/2018, \$750.00.

Chung, Taesun, Young Kim for Congress, CT, Taesun Chung, MD, 10/22/2018, \$1,000.00.

Chung, Taesun P., Roskam for Congress Committee, CT, Self-Employed, 03/06/2014, \$500.00.

Richard M. Mills, Jr., of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and the Deputy Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Nominee: Richard M. Mills, Jr.

Post: USUN (Deputy Permanent Rep.)

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$400.00, 3/18, David Bequette for Congress Committee.

2. Spouse: Leigh Carter, \$1,000.00, 12/17, David Bequette for Congress Committee; \$400.00, 3/18, David Bequette for Congress Committee.

3. Children and Spouses: None.

4. Parents: Richard Mills, Sr., Joanne Lloyd Mills.

5. Grandparents: All have been deceased since 2015.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Randolph Lloyd Mills; Sharon Mills.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Malise Mills Fletcher; (No Spouse), \$100.00, 9/18, Beto O'Rourke for Texas Senate Campaign; \$50.00, 6/19, Kamala Harris for President Committee; \$50.00, 6/19, Action for Pete Buttigieg Campaign; \$50.00, 6/19, Amy Klobucher for President Campaign.

William Ellison Grayson, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Estonia.

Nominee: William Ellison Grayson.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Estonia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: William E. Grayson: See attached page for contribution information.

2. Spouse: Lauren B. Grayson: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Katherine S. Grayson, Elizabeth M. Grayson, Caroline E. Grayson: None.

4. Parents: Ellison C. Grayson, Jr.: See attached page for contribution information. Jean M. Grayson: \$200, 2018, Beth Lindstrom for US Senate.

5. Grandparents: Mr. and Mrs. William H. Mason: Deceased. Mr. and Mrs. Ellison C. Grayson: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Darby Grayson Sutherland: None. Bruce Sutherland: None.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REPORT

ATTACHMENT

Nominee: William Ellison Grayson.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Estonia.

Nominated: January 28, 2020.

William E. Grayson Contributions: amount, date, and donee:

\$500, 2015, Cotton for Senate; \$2700, 2015, Jeb 2016, Inc.; \$500, 2016, Hawaii Republican Party; \$900, 2016, CA Republican Party Federal Account; \$250, 2016, Ro for Congress, Inc.; \$500, 2018, McSally for Senate, Inc.; \$1000, 2018, Alaskans for Dan Sullivan; \$2000, 2019, Trump Victory.

Ellison C. Grayson Contributions:

\$550, 2015, Republican National Committee; \$550, 2016, NRCC; \$450, 2016, Republican National Committee; \$1700, 2016, Ryan for Congress; \$500, 2016, Team Ryan; \$125, 2017, Republican National Committee; \$100, 2017, NRCC; \$200, 2017, Ryan for Congress; \$200, 2018, Ryan for Congress; \$100, 2018, Republican National Committee.

Aldona Z. Wos, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

Nominee: Aldona Zofia Wos.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Canada.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$35,000.00, 1/15/2019, Trump Victory; \$5,400.00, 10/12/2018, John James for Senate; \$10,000.00, 10/10/2018, Republican National Committee; \$1,000.00, 8/29/2018, Housley For

Senate; \$2,000.00, 7/23/2018, Re-Elect Justice Jackson Committee; \$2,700.00, 6/21/2018, Ted Budd For Congress; \$2,500.00, 6/21/2018, Thom Tillis Committee; \$35,000.00, 2/7/2018, Republican National Committee; \$250.00, 9/21/2017, Friends Of Frank Ryan; \$1,000.00, 6/28/2017, Re-Elect Justice Jackson Committee; \$1,000.00, 6/28/2017, Heath For North Carolina; \$3,650.00, 6/17/2017, Republican National Committee; \$2,700.00, 6/5/2017, Trump Victory; \$35,000.00, 4/21/2017, Republican National Committee; \$1,000.00, 12/15/2016, Re-Elect Justice Bob Edmunds; \$5,000.00, 12/2/2016, Trump For America, Inc.; \$-2,700.00, 11/2/2016, Refund—Mark Walker 4 NC; \$2,700.00, 11/2/2016, Mark Walker 4 NC; \$1,000.00, 9/30/2016, North Carolina Republican Party; \$2,700.00, 9/12/2016, Ted Budd For Congress; \$1,000.00, 6/22/2016, Friends Of Frank Ryan; \$2,700.00, 5/25/2016, Mark Walker 4 NC; \$1,000.00, 5/23/2016, Hank Henning For Congress; \$1,000.00, 5/23/2016, Ted Budd For Congress; \$400.00, 4/21/2016, North Carolina Republican Party; \$1,000.00, 3/29/2016, Re-Elect Justice Edmunds Campaign; \$5,100.00, 2/17/2016, The Dollar For House Committee; \$33,400.00, 1/28/2016, Republican National Committee; \$5,100.00, 1/26/2016, Folwell Committee.

2. Spouse: Louis DeJoy (husband): \$5,000.00, 2/25/2020, Guilford County Republican Party; \$5,400.00, 2/24/2020, Jim O'Neill Attorney General; \$210,600.00, 2/17/2020, Trump Victory; \$100,000.00, 1/13/2020, Trump Victory; \$50,000.00, 1/13/2020, Trump Victory; \$10,000.00, 1/10/2020, North Carolina Republican Party; \$5,600.00, 12/27/2019, John James U.S. Senate; \$5,600.00, 12/5/2019, McConnell Senate Committee; \$35,000.00, 12/5/2019, NRSC; \$2,800.00, 8/30/2019, Dan Bishop for Congress; \$5,600.00, 8/6/2019, Hudson for Congress; \$3,000.00, 8/6/2019, Greater Greensboro Republican Women's Club (GGRWC); \$10,000.00, 7/23/2019, North Carolina Republican Party; \$5,400.00, 6/27/2019, Vi Lyles for Mayor; \$750.00, 6/14/2019, David Rouzer for Congress; \$120,000.00, 6/13/2019, Trump Victory; \$5,600.00, 6/10/2019, Texans for Senator John Cornyn; \$5,600.00, 6/10/2019, McSally for Senate; \$5,400.00, 5/28/2019, Newby for Justice; \$100,000.00, 5/17/2019, Trump Victory; \$5,600.00, 4/30/2019, Walker for NC; \$1,000.00, 4/22/2019, Mecklenburg County Republican Executive Committee; \$5,000.00, 4/3/2019, Guilford County Republican Party—Lincoln Regan Dinner; \$100,000.00, 4/1/2019, Trump Victory; \$5,000.00, 1/24/2019, Great America Committee; \$35,000.00, 1/15/2019, Trump Victory; \$250,000.00, 12/31/2018, Charlotte 2020 Host Committee, Inc.; \$5,400.00, 10/12/2018, John James for Senate; \$2,700.00, 10/9/2018, Glassner for Mayor; \$500.00, 9/11/2018, Young Kim For Congress; \$25,000.00, 8/30/2018, Budd Harris Victory Committee; \$50,000.00, 8/23/2018, Trump Victory; \$10,000.00, 6/28/2018, Friends of Scott Walker; \$5,200.00, 6/26/2018, Friends of Troy Lawson; \$3,500.00, 6/20/2018, McMaster for Governor; \$10,000.00, 6/15/2018, 2018 Thom Tillis Senate Candidate Fund; \$50,000.00, 5/21/2018, Trump Victory; \$33,900.00, 5/16/2018, National Republican Senatorial Committee (NRSC); \$5,000.00, 5/16/2018, Tillis Majority Committee; \$2,500.00, 4/27/2018, Guilford County Republican Party; \$35,000.00, 4/9/2018, Republican National Committee; \$2,700.00, 3/27/2018, Josh Hawley for Senate; \$3,500.00, 3/7/2018, McMaster for Governor; \$100,000.00, 2/7/2018, Republican National Committee; \$100,000.00, 2/7/2018, Trump Victory; \$2,700.00, 1/25/2018, Rick for Congress; \$40,750.00, 12/1/2017, Republican National Committee; \$500.00, 11/7/2017, Hudson for Congress; \$500.00, 10/20/2017, GCGOP—150th Anniversary Luncheon; \$100,000.00, 9/28/2017, Trump Victory; \$1,200.00, 8/28/2017, Greater Greensboro Republican Women's Club; \$10,000.00, 7/21/2017, North Carolina Republican Party; \$5,400.00, 6/28/2017, Ted Budd for Congress; \$1,000.00, 6/19/2017, Henry McMaster for Governor; \$10,000.00, 6/2/2017, Handel Victory Committee; \$100,000.00, 6/2/2017, Trump

Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Right to Rise PAC, Inc., \$5,000.00, 1/6/2015; Levy, Leora, Zeldin for Congress, \$1,000.00, 2/8/2015; Levy, Leora, Portman for Senate Committee, \$1,700.00, 3/31/2015; Levy, Leora, Portman for Senate Committee, \$2,700.00, 3/31/2015; Levy, Leora, McSally for Congress, \$500.00, 4/21/2015; Levy, Leora, Winning Women 2016, \$2,500.00, 4/21/2015; Levy, Leora, Comstock for Congress, \$500.00, 4/21/2015; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$10,000.00, 4/23/2015; Levy, Leora, R. Mrs., Right to Rise PAC, Inc., \$5,000.00, 4/26/2015; Levy, Leora, R. Mrs., Right to Rise USA, \$5,000.00, 5/12/2015; Levy, Leora, The Richard Burr Committee, \$2,700.00, 5/12/2015; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Marco Rubio for President, \$1,000.00, 6/8/2015; Levy, Leora, Elise for Congress, \$500.00, 6/10/2015; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., NRCC, \$1,000.00, 6/10/2015; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Jeb 2016, Inc., \$2,700.00, 6/15/2015; Levy, Leora, Friends of John Boehner, \$1,800.00, 6/16/2015; Levy, Leora, Boehner for Speaker, \$1,800.00, 6/16/2015; Levy, Leora, Stivers for Congress,

\$500.00, 6/16/2015; Levy, Leora Ms., Renee Ellmers for Congress Committee, \$500.00, 6/30/2015; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Scott Garrett for Congress, \$500.00, 6/30/2015; Levy, Leora, McMorris Rodgers American Dream Project, The, \$500.00, 6/30/2015; Levy, Leora, Cathy McMorris Rodgers for Congress, \$500.00, 6/30/2015; Levy, Leora, Zeldin for Congress, \$500.00, 6/30/2015; Levy, Leora Mrs., NRSC, \$5,000.00, 7/1/2015; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$100.00, 7/17/2015; Levy, Leora, Conservative, Authentic, Responsive Leadership for You and for America, \$500.00, 7/22/2015; Levy, Leora Mrs., NRCC, \$1,000.00, 7/27/2015; Levy, Leora, Conservative, Authentic, Responsive Leadership for You and for America, \$500.00, 8/10/2015; Levy, Leora Mrs., NRSC, \$5,000.00, 8/10/2015; Levy, Leora, August Wolf for Senate, \$2,700.00, 8/28/2015; Levy, Leora, Heaney for Congress, \$250.00, 9/19/2015; Levy, Leora, Shaban for Congress, \$, 9/30/2015; Levy, Leora, Shaban for Congress, \$500.00, 9/30/2015; Levy, Leora, Ryan for Congress, Inc., \$250.00, 10/5/2015; Levy, Leora R. Ms., NRCC, \$5,000.00, 10/5/2015; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$8,000.00, 10/16/2015; Levy, Leora, Ron Johnson for Senate Inc., \$5,400.00, 10/21/2015; Levy, Leora, Citizens for Turner, \$2,700.00, 10/22/2015; Levy, Leora, Ron Johnson for Senate Inc., \$(2,700.00), 10/22/2015; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$1,000.00, 10/23/2015; Levy, Leora, New Hampshire Republican State Committee, \$299.00, 11/1/2015; Levy, Leora, Zeldin for Congress, \$100.00, 11/7/2015; Levy, Leora, Zeldin for Congress, \$1,100.00, 11/8/2015; Levy, Leora, Zeldin for Congress, \$1,600.00, 11/8/2015; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$8,000.00, 11/16/2015; Levy, Leora, Friends of Roy Blunt, \$250.00, 11/16/2015; Levy, Leora, Tim Scott for Senate, \$579.61, 12/1/2015; Levy, Leora, Future45, \$1,000.00, 12/10/2015; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$9,000.00, 12/14/2015; Levy, Leora, Ron Johnson for Senate Inc., \$(2,700.00), 1/26/2016; Levy, Leora, Ron Johnson for Senate Inc., \$2,700.00, 1/26/2016; Levy, Leora, Ron Johnson for Senate Inc., \$2,700.00, 1/26/2016; Levy, Leora R., Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc., \$2,200.00, 2/5/2016; Levy, Leora, Ryan for Congress, Inc., \$2,450.00, 2/13/2016; Levy, Leora, Team Ryan, \$5,000.00, 2/13/2016; Levy, Leora, Team Ryan, \$5,400.00, 2/13/2016; Levy, Leora, Ryan for Congress, Inc., \$2,700.00, 2/13/2016; Levy, Leora Mrs., Cruz for President, \$2,700.00, 2/26/2016; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Marco Rubio for President, \$1,700.00, 2/26/2016; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$5,000.00, 2/29/2016; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., NRCC, \$5,000.00, 3/17/2016; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., NRCC, \$1,000.00, 3/18/2016; Levy, Leora Mrs., Friends of Pat Toomey, \$2,700.00, 3/24/2016; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$450.00, 3/25/2016; Levy, Leora R. Ms., NRCC, \$5,000.00, 3/31/2016; Levy, Leora R. Ms., NRCC, \$250.00, 3/31/2016; Levy, Leora, Trusted Leadership PAC, \$10,000.00, 4/4/2016; Levy, Leora, Right Principles PAC, \$500.00, 4/14/2016; Levy, Leora Mrs., Cruz for President, \$(2,700.00), 4/16/2016; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$35.00, 4/18/2016; Levy, Leora R. Ms., NRCC, \$4,000.00, 4/27/2016; Levy, Leora, Royce Campaign Committee, \$1,000.00, 4/29/2016; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$35.00, 4/30/2016; Levy, Leora, Shaban for Congress, \$1,000.00, 5/23/2016; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 5/25/2016; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$2,700.00, 5/27/2016; Levy, Leora, McMorris Rodgers American DREAM PROJECT, THE, \$2,700.00, 6/1/2016; Levy, Leora, Cathy McMorris Rodgers for Congress, \$2,200.00, 6/1/2016; Levy, Leora, Cathy McMorris Rodgers for Congress, \$500.00, 6/1/2016; Levy, Leora, Wells for Security, \$1,000.00, 6/10/2016; Levy, Leora, Russell Taub for Congress, Inc., \$500.00, 6/12/2016; Levy,

Leora, Carter 2016, \$2,700.00, 6/18/2016; Levy, Leora, Clay Cope for Congress, \$500.00, 6/20/2016; Levy, Leora, Kirk Victory 2016, \$1,000.00, 6/20/2016; Levy, Leora, Kirk for Senate, \$1,000.00, 6/20/2016; Levy, Leora, Stivers for Congress, \$1,000.00, 6/20/2016; Levy, Leora, Trey Gowdy for Congress, \$500.00, 6/22/2016; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$35.00, 6/24/2016; Levy, Leora, The Congressman Joe Barton Committee, \$1,000.00, 6/29/2016; Levy, Leora Mrs., Virginia Foxx for Congress, \$500.00, 6/29/2016; Levy, Leora Mrs., Friends of John McCain Inc., \$500.00, 6/30/2016; Levy, Leora, Shaban for Congress, \$1,700.00, 6/30/2016; Levy, Leora Mrs., Ted Cruz for Senate, \$2,700.00, 7/2/2016; Levy, Leora Mrs., Ted Cruz for Senate, \$2,700.00, 7/2/2016; Levy, Leora Mrs., Cruz for President, \$(2,700.00), 7/2/2016; Levy, Leora, Russell Taub for Congress, Inc., \$180.00, 8/3/2016; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$350.00, 8/22/2016; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$40.00, 8/23/2016; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$25.00, 8/23/2016; Levy, Leora Mrs., Friends of John McCain Inc., \$1,700.00, 8/26/2016; Levy, Leora Rosenberg, Joe Wilson for Congress, \$500.00, 9/15/2016; Levy, Leora, McMorris Rodgers American Dream Project, The, \$1,000.00, 9/22/2016; Levy, Leora, Alabama Republican Party, \$33.10, 9/25/2016; Levy, Leora, Shaban for Congress, \$, 9/30/2016; Levy, Leora, Trump Victory, \$25,000.00, 10/3/2016; Levy, Leora, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., \$2,700.00, 10/3/2016; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$22,300.00, 10/3/2016; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$11,100.00, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$(650.00), 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Trump Victory, \$25,000.00, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, California Republican Party Federal Act, \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, West Virginia Republican Party, Inc., \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, West Virginia Republican Party, Inc., \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Louisiana, \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Louisiana, \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Mississippi Republican Party, \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Mississippi Republican Party, \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, North Dakota Republican Party, \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee, \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Alabama Republican Party, \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Arkansas, \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, West Virginia Republican Party, Inc., \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, California Republican Party Federal Act, \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Wyoming Republican Party, Inc., \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Arkansas, \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Arkansas, \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, California Republican Party Federal Act, \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Virginia Inc., \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Virginia Inc., \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Virginia Inc., \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Kansas Republican Party, \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Kansas Republican Party, \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Kansas Republican Party, \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Wyoming Republican Party, Inc., \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Illinois Republican Party, \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Illinois Republican Party, \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Illinois Republican Party, \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Missouri Republican State Committee-Federal, \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Missouri Republican State Committee-Federal, \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Missouri Republican State Committee-Federal, \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, North Dakota Republican Party, \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, North Dakota

Republican Party, \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Alabama Republican Party, \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Federal Committee of Pennsylvania, \$727.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee, \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee, \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Wisconsin, \$32.50, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Wisconsin, \$33.10, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Wisconsin, \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, Mississippi Republican Party, \$661.90, 10/11/2016; Levy, Leora, The Richard Burr Committee, \$1,000.00, 10/14/2016; Levy, Leora, South Carolina Republican Party, \$661.90, 10/17/2016; Levy, Leora, New Jersey Republican State Committee, \$661.90, 10/17/2016; Levy, Leora, Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account, \$661.90, 10/17/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Minnesota-Federal, \$661.90, 10/17/2016; Levy, Leora, North Carolina Republican Party, \$661.90, 10/17/2016; Levy, Leora, Friends of Todd Young, Inc., \$500.00, 10/19/2016; Levy, Leora, North Carolina Republican Party, \$33.10, 10/27/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Minnesota-Federal, \$33.10, 10/27/2016; Levy, Leora, South Carolina Republican Party, \$33.10, 10/27/2016; Levy, Leora, Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account, \$33.10, 10/27/2016; Levy, Leora, New Jersey Republican State Committee, \$33.10, 10/27/2016; Levy, Leora, Friends of Frank Guinta, \$1,000.00, 11/3/2016; Levy, Leora, Let America Work, \$1,000.00, 11/4/2016; Levy, Leora, Marsha Blackburn for Congress, Inc., \$250.00, 11/7/2016; Levy, Leora Rosenberg, Joe Wilson for Congress, \$100.00, 11/7/2016; Levy, Leora Mrs., Virginia Foxx for Congress, \$100.00, 11/7/2016; Levy, Leora Ms., Citizens for Turner, \$500.00, 11/7/2016; Levy, Leora, Zeldin for Congress, \$500.00, 11/7/2016; Levy, Leora, Republican Party of Minnesota-Federal, \$32.50, 11/7/2016; Levy, Leora, North Carolina Republican Party, \$32.50, 11/7/2016; Levy, Leora, Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account, \$32.50, 11/7/2016; Levy, Leora, New Jersey Republican State Committee, \$32.50, 11/7/2016; Levy, Leora, South Carolina Republican Party, \$32.50, 11/8/2016; Levy, Leora, Connecticut Republican Party, \$1,780.00, 11/20/2016.

Contributor, state committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Levy, Leora, Norwalk Republican Town Committee, \$125.00, 4/23/2015; Leora Levy, Bridgeport Republican Town Committee, \$100.00, 5/28/2015; Leora Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$120.00, 11/18/2015; Leora Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$250.00, 11/19/2015; Leora Levy, Senate Republican Campaign Committee, \$125.00, 11/30/2015; Leora Levy, Bridgeport Republican Town Committee, \$1,000.00, 4/6/2016; Leora Levy, Bridgeport Republican Town Committee, \$50.00, 4/15/2016; Leora Levy, Bridgeport Republican Town Committee, \$100.00, 5/26/2016; Leora Levy, House Republican Campaign Committee, \$1,000.00, 6/21/2016; Leora Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$140.00, 7/5/2016; Leora Levy, Senate Republican Campaign Committee, \$1,000.00, 7/25/2016; Leora Levy, Perpignan 2016, \$100.00, 7/31/2016; Leora Levy, Frantz for State Senate, \$100.00, 8/9/2016; Leora Levy, Friends of John Frey, \$100.00, 8/24/2016; Leora Levy, Committee to Re-Elect Senator John A. Kissel, \$100.00, 8/25/2016; Leora Levy, The Committee to Re-Elect Charles R. Paonessa, \$100.00, 8/27/2016; Leora Levy, Crouch for Senate, \$100.00, 8/27/2016; Leora Levy, Carolyn Mirek for State Senate, \$100.00, 8/27/2016; Leora Levy, Bumgardner for Connecticut, \$100.00, 8/27/2016; Leora Levy, Ethan Book for State Representative-128th, \$100.00, 8/27/2016; Leora Levy, Kelly for Senate 2016, \$100.00, 8/27/2016; Leora Levy, Valentine for State Rep, \$100.00, 8/27/2016; Leora

Levy, Dempsey for State Rep, \$100.00, 9/17/2016; Leora Levy, Evans for the 48th, \$100.00, 9/17/2016; Leora Levy, Cos Cob Republican Inc., \$120.00, 9/25/2016; Leora Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$500.00, 10/15/2016.

Contributor, committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date

Levy, Leora, Zeldin for Congress, \$2,700.00, 3/23/2017; Levy, Leora Mrs., Virginia Foxx for Congress, \$1,000.00, 4/20/2017; Levy, Leora, Handel for Congress, Inc, \$500.00, 4/20/2017; Levy, Leora, Leadership Connecticut Pac, \$500.00, 6/5/2017; Levy, Leora, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee, \$2,000.00, 6/19/2017; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$9,925.00, 6/22/2017; Levy, Leora Mrs., Citizens for Turner, \$1,000.00, 6/30/2017; Levy, Leora, Bartos for Senate Inc, \$1,000.00, 6/30/2017; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 7/5/2017; Levy, Leora Mrs., NRSC \$5,000.00, 7/6/2017; Levy, Leora, Mast for Congress, \$1,000.00, 7/6/2017; Levy, Leora Mrs., Strange for Senate, \$1,000.00, 7/24/2017; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 8/3/2017; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 9/6/2017; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 10/5/2017; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Cotton for Senate, \$1,000.00, 10/23/2017; Levy, Leora, Citizens for Josh Mandel Inc., \$2,700.00, 10/23/2017; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Cotton Victory, \$1,000.00, 10/23/2017; Levy, Leora, Team Josh \$2,700.00, 10/23/2017; Levy, Leora, Mast for Congress, \$500.00, 10/31/2017; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 11/2/2017; Levy, Leora, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., \$2,000.00, 11/13/2017; Levy, Leora, Trump Victory, \$2,000.00, 11/13/2017; Levy, Leora, Cathy McMorris Rodgers for Congress, \$1,000.00, 12/4/2017; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$3,000.00, 12/5/2017; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$100.00, 12/14/2017; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 1/5/2018; Levy, Leora Ms., Greg Pence for Congress, \$500.00, 1/30/2018; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 2/2/2018; Levy, Leora Mrs., Greg Pence for Congress, \$500.00, 2/12/2018; Levy, Leora, Morrissey for Senate Inc, \$500.00, 2/12/2018; Levy, Leora Mrs., Virginia Foxx for Congress, \$1,000.00, 2/13/2018; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$4.96, 2/18/2018; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 3/1/2018; Levy, Leora, Mark Burns for Congress, \$500.00, 3/7/2018; Levy, Leora, Poliquin for Congress, \$1,000.00, 3/28/2018; Levy, Leora, Rothfus for Congress, \$1,000.00, 3/28/2018; Levy, Leora, Glenn Grothman for Congress, \$1,000.00, 3/28/2018; Levy, Leora, Santos for Congress, \$500.00, 3/31/2018; Levy, Leora, Heller for Senate, \$1,000.00, 3/31/2018; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 4/2/2018; Levy, Leora, Faso for Congress, \$250.00, 4/26/2018; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 5/1/2018; Levy, Leora, Corey for Senate, \$500.00, 5/18/2018; Levy, Leora, Corey for Senate, \$500.00, 5/18/2018; Levy, Leora, NRSC (In Kind), \$2,084.84, 5/22/2018; Levy, Leora, Mast for Congress, \$1,000.00, 5/25/2018; Levy, Leora Mrs., Virginia Foxx for Congress, \$1,000.00, 5/25/2018; Levy, Leora, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee, \$2,000.00, 5/30/2018; Levy, Leora Mrs., NRSC, \$1,631.60, 6/1/2018; Levy, Leora, Morrissey for Senate Inc, \$500.00, 6/12/2018; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$5,000.00, 6/14/2018; Levy, Leora, Chele Farley for Senate Inc, \$1,000.00, 6/14/2018; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Cotton for Senate, \$2,100.00, 6/15/2018; Levy, Leora R., Scott Taylor for Congress, \$500.00, 6/15/2018; Levy, Leora, Lena for Congress, \$500.00, 6/15/2018; Levy, Leora, Cathy McMorris Rodgers for

Congress, \$800.00, 6/19/2018; Levy, Leora, Cathy McMorris Rodgers for Congress, \$1,700.00, 6/19/2018; Levy, Leora, Zeldin for Congress, \$1,000.00, 6/19/2018; Levy, Leora, Faso for Congress, \$1,000.00, 6/19/2018; Levy, Leora, Schneider for Congress, \$360.00, 6/20/2018; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Cotton for Senate, \$(1,000.00), 6/30/2018; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., Cotton for Senate, \$1,000.00, 6/30/2018; Levy, Leora, Josh Hawley for Senate, \$1,000.00, 6/30/2018; Levy, Leora Mrs., NRSC, \$15,000.00, 7/20/2018; Levy, Leora, Cramer for Senate, \$500.00, 7/24/2018; Levy, Leora Mrs., Citizens for Turner, \$1,000.00, 8/6/2018; Levy, Leora, Leah Victory Fund, \$500.00, 8/31/2018; Levy, Leora Mrs., Wicker for Senate, \$1,000.00, 9/19/2018; Levy, Leora, Marsha for Senate, \$1,000.00, 9/23/2018; Levy, Leora, NRCC (In Kind), \$950.77, 9/24/2018; Levy, Leora, NRCC (In Kind), \$4,709.28, 9/24/2018; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., NRCC, \$10,000.00, 9/25/2018; Levy, Leora, Corey for Senate, \$500.00, 10/13/2018; Levy, Leora, Ann Wagner for Congress, \$500.00, 10/17/2018; Levy, Leora, Harry for CT Inc, \$1,000.00, 10/18/2018; Levy, Leora, Marsha for Senate, \$1,000.00, 10/23/2018; Levy, Leora R., Connecticut Republican Party, \$35.00, 10/25/2018; Levy, Leora, Faso for Congress, \$500.00, 10/30/2018; Levy, Leora R., Tom MacArthur for Congress, \$500.00, 10/30/2018; Levy, Leora, WendyRogers.Org, \$250.00, 11/3/2018; Levy, Leora, Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 11/1/2018; Levy, Leora R. Mrs., NRCC, \$5,660.05, 12/17/2018.

Contributor, state committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date

Leora Levy, McDonald for State Senate, \$100.00, 1/23/2017; Leora Levy, EDG115, \$100.00, 2/6/2017; Leora Levy, Enfield Republican Town Committee, \$70.00, 3/17/2017; Leora Levy, Lumaj Explore, \$100.00, 3/31/2017; Leora Levy, Steve Obsitnik for Connecticut, \$100.00, 5/5/2017; Leora Levy, Ridgefield Republican Town Committee, \$50.00, 5/9/2017; Leora Levy, Bridgeport Republican Town Committee, \$2,000.00, 6/3/2017; Leora Levy, Re-Elect Erin, \$50.00, 6/5/2017; Leora Levy, Connecticut Federation of College Republicans PAC, \$500.00, 6/12/2017; Leora Levy, Re-Elect Erin, \$60.00, 6/30/2017; Leora Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$120.00, 7/5/2017; Leora Levy, Boucher for CT, \$100.00, 8/4/2017; Leora Levy, Markley for LG, \$100.00, 8/15/2017; Leora Levy, Ridgefield Republican Town Committee, \$225.00, 9/5/2017; Leora Levy, Ridgefield Republican Town Committee, \$200.00, 9/8/2017; Leora Levy, Cos Cob Republican Inc., \$120.00, 9/24/2017; Leora Levy, Srinivasan for Governor, \$100.00, 9/27/2017; Leora Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$500.00, 11/2/2017; Leora Levy, Bob for Governor, \$100.00, 12/16/2017; Leora Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$65.00, 1/3/2018; Leora Levy, Thad for CT Treasurer, \$100.00, 2/3/2018; Leora Levy, Sampson for CT, \$50.00, 2/12/2018; Leora Levy, Senate Republican Leadership Committee, \$2,000.00, 4/14/2018; Leora Levy, Shaban for AG, \$100.00, 4/22/2018; Leora Levy, Connecticut Republican Party, \$5,000.00, 4/24/2018; Leora Levy, Bridgeport Republican Town Committee, \$100.00, 5/10/2018; Leora Levy, Thad for CT Treasurer, \$1,000.00, 5/23/2018; Leora Levy, Feehan for 120, \$100.00, 5/30/2018; Leora Levy, Committee to Re-Elect Senator John A. Kissel, \$100.00, 6/14/2018; Leora Levy, DeLucia 2018, \$100.00, 7/25/2018; Leora Levy, R. 95, \$100.00, 7/25/2018; Leora Levy, Roman 2018, \$100.00, 7/25/2018; Leora Levy, Bridgeport Republican Town Committee, \$1,000.00, 7/27/2018; Leora Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$500.00, 7/27/2018; Leora Levy, Bob for Governor, \$3,500.00, 8/31/2018; Leora Levy, Cos Cob Republican Inc., \$130.00, 9/23/2018; Leora Levy, R. 92, \$150.00, 10/11/2018.

Contributor, committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Levy, Leora, Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 1/2/2019; Levy, Leora, Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 2/1/2019.

Contributor, state committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Leora Levy, Stamford Republican Town Committee, \$500.00, 1/29/2019; Leora Levy, Connecticut Republican Party, \$35.00, 2/19/2019; Leora Levy, Bridgeport Republican Town Committee, \$250.00, 2/20/2019; Leora Levy, Sara Muska, \$100.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$2,000.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Connecticut Republican Party, \$10,000.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Dick Moccia, \$100.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Madison Republican Town Committee, \$100.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Groton Republican Town Committee, \$100.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Wethersfield Republican Town Committee, \$100.00, 2019; Leora Levy, New Haven Republican Town Committee, \$100.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Sprague Town Committee, \$50.00, 2019; Leora Levy Tom Banisch, \$50.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Erin Stewart, \$50.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Jon Leblanc, \$50.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Enfield Republican Town Committee, \$50.00, 2019; Leora Levy, New Milford Republican Town Committee, \$80.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Carmela Budkins, \$100.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Marv Ann Turner, \$100.00, 2019; Leora Levy, Republican Roundtable of Greenwich, \$400.00, 6/4/2019.

Contributor, committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Levy, Steven, M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 5/7/2013; Levy, Steven, Connecticut Republican SCC, \$2,500.00, 5/24/2013; Levy, Steven Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 6/6/2013; Levy, Steven, American Crossroads, \$5,000.00, 6/24/2013; Levy, Steven Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 7/8/2013; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 8/7/2013; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 9/6/2013; Levy, Steven, Rounds For Senate, \$1,000.00, 9/9/2013; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Scott Garrett For Congress, \$2,600.00, 9/30/2013; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 10/7/2013; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 11/7/2013; Levy, Steven, Terri Lynn Land For Senate, \$2,600.00, 11/30/2013; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 12/5/2013; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 1/7/2014; Levy, Steven, Connecticut Republican SCC, \$5,000.00, 1/31/2014; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 2/7/2014; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 3/6/2014; Levy, Steven, McConnell Victory Kentucky, \$2,600.00, 3/21/2014; Levy, Steven, M., Debicella For Congress 2014, \$2,600.00, 3/25/2014; Levy, Steven, McConnell Senate Committee '14, \$2,600.00, 3/31/2014; Levy, Steven Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 4/7/2014; Levy, Steven, M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 5/7/2014; Levy, Steven, M., Debicella For Congress 2014, \$1,000.00, 9/30/2014; Levy, Steven M. Mr., National Republican Senatorial Committee, \$2,000.00, 9/30/2014; Levy, Steven, Tisel, Congressional Committee, \$500.00, 9/30/2014; Levy, Steve M., Alliance For Advancing America, \$1,000.00, 10/13/2014; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Ed Gillespie For Senate, \$500.00, 10/13/2014; Levy, Steven, M., Thom Tilus Committee, \$500.00, 10/15/2014; Levy, Steven, Ben Sasse For US Senate Inc, \$1,000.00, 11/3/2014; Levy, Steven, Senate Battleground Fund, \$1,300.00, 11/17/2014; Levy, Steven, Bill Cassidy For US Senate, \$1,300.00, 11/16/2014.

Contributor, committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Steven Levy, Republican Roundtable of Greenwich, \$225.00, 9/27/2013; Steven Levy, Foley For CT, \$375.00, 11/23/2013; Steven Levy,

Foley For CT, \$100.00, 2/11/2014; Steven Levy, Penny For CT, \$100.00, 4/20/2014; Steven Levy, Kie Westby For Attorney General, \$100.00, 9/11/2014.

Contributor, committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Levy, Steven Mr., Right To Rise Pac, Inc., \$5,000.00, 1/6/2015; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 1/6/2015; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 2/6/2015; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 3/4/2015; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 3/6/2015; Levy, Steven M. Portman For Senate Committee, \$1,000.00, 3/31/2015; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 4/6/2015; Levy, Steven M. Portman For Senate Committee, \$79.13, 4/19/2015; Levy, Steven M. Portman For Senate Committee, \$1,700.00, 4/19/2015; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Virginia Foxx For Congress, \$1,000.00, 4/24/2015; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 5/6/2015; Levy, Steven M. Republican National Committee, \$1,600.00, 6/8/2015; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$3,400.00, 6/8/2015; Levy, Steven Mr., Jeb 2016, Inc., \$2,700.00, 6/18/2015; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 7/6/2015; Levy, Steven Mr., John Bolton Pac, \$2,500.00, 8/31/2015; Levy, Steve Mr., Ron Johnson For Senate Inc, \$2,700.00, 10/22/2015; Levy, Steven M., Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc, \$500.00, 12/4/2015; Levy, Steven, Cruz For President \$2,700.00, 3/19/2016; Levy, Steven M., Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 4/6/2016; Levy, Steven, Cruz For President, \$(2,700.00), 4/16/2016; Levy, Steven M., Mr., Families For James Lankford, \$1,000.00, 5/5/2016; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 5/11/2016; Levy, Steven Mr., Ron Johnson For Senate Inc, \$(2,700.00), 5/21/2016; Levy, Steven Mr., Ron Johnson For Senate Inc, \$2,700.00, 5/21/2016; Levy, Steven Mr., Ron Johnson For Senate Inc, \$2,700.00, 5/21/2016; Levy, Steven Mr., Ron Johnson For Senate Inc, \$2,700.00, 5/21/2016; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 6/13/2016; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 8/10/2016; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Friends Of Pat Toomey, \$1,000.00, 8/25/2016; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$5,000.00, 9/21/2016; Levy, Steven Mr., Friends Of Pat Toomey, \$1,000.00, 9/25/2016; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Friends Of Pat Toomey, \$1,000.00, 10/25/2016; Levy, Steven Mr., Friends Of Pat Toomey, \$1,000.00, 11/25/2016; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Friends Of Pat Toomey, \$1,000.00, 12/25/2016.

Contributor, committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Levy, Steven M. Mr., Friends of Pat Toomey, \$700.00, 1/25/2017; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Friends of Pat Toomey, \$300.00, 1/25/2017; Levy, Steven Mr., John Bolton Super PAC, \$4,000.00, 9/1/2017; Levy, Steven M Mr., Republican National Committee, \$3,000.00, 12/5/2017; Levy, Steven, Ted Cruz for Senate, \$2,700.00, 1/25/2018; Levy, Steven, Matt Rosendale for Montana, \$1,000.00, 1/30/2018; Levy, Steven Mr., John Bolton Super PAC, \$5,000.00, 2/1/2018; Levy, Steven, Protect the House, \$5,000.00, 3/7/2018; Levy, Steven, Great America Committee, \$2,500.00, 3/7/2018; Levy, Steven, Zeldin for Congress, \$2,700.00, 3/28/2018; Levy, Steven, Trump Victory, \$5,400.00, 4/26/2018; Levy, Steven, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., \$2,700.00, 4/26/2018; Levy, Steven, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., \$2,700.00, 4/26/2018; Levy, Steven M. Mr., NRSC, \$1,631.60, 6/1/2018; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 6/1/2018; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 7/2/2018; Levy, Steve, Morrissy for Senate Inc, \$1,000.00, 8/1/2018; Levy, Steven, Connecticut Republican

Party, \$5,000.00, 8/31/2018; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 9/4/2018; Levy, Steven, Matt Rosendale for Montana, \$1,000.00, 9/25/2018; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 10/3/2018; Levy, Steven M. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$6,000.00, 12/7/2018.

Contributor, state committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Steven Levy, McDonald for State Senate, \$100.00, 1/23/2017; Steven Levy, Bridgeport Republican Town Committee, \$100.00, 6/3/2017; Steven Levy, Republican Roundtable of Greenwich, \$400.00, 6/9/2017; Steven Levy, Thad for CT Treasurer, \$250.00, 3/26/2018; Steven Levy, Bob for Governor, \$3,500.00, 8/31/2018; Steven Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$2,000.00, 9/10/2018; Steven Levy, Republican Roundtable of Greenwich, \$100.00, 7/10/1905.

Contributor, committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Levy, Steven, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., \$10.00, 5/7/2019.

Contributor, federal committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Levy, Peter, Debicella for Congress 2014, \$250.00, 4/21/2014; Levy, Peter, Debicella for Congress 2014, \$500.00, 9/4/2014; Levy, Peter B Mr., National Republican Senatorial Committee, \$1,000.00, 10/9/2014; Levy, Peter B Mr., National Republican Senatorial Committee, \$1,000.00, 10/10/2014; Levy, Peter B. Mr., NRCC, \$250.00, 10/14/2014; Levy Peter B, Connecticut Republican SCC, \$2,500.00, 9/26/2014; Levy, Peter B. Mr., NRCC, \$500.00, 10/16/2014; Levy, Peter B, Connecticut Republican SCC, \$250.00, 3/31/2014; Levy, Peter B. Mr., NRCC, \$250.00, 11/3/2014; Levy, Peter B. Mr., Connecticut Republican SCC, \$250.00, 7/26/2013; Levy, Peter, Friends of Nan Hayworth, \$250.00, 11/3/2014; Levy, Peter, Debicella for Congress 2014, \$1,000.00, 8/13/2014; Levy, Peter B. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$(5.00), 9/12/2016; Levy, Peter B. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$33,400.00, 10/7/2016; Levy, Peter B. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$(505.00), 10/7/2016; Levy, Peter B. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$(500.00), 9/8/2016; Levy, Peter B. Mr., Republican National Committee, \$(500.00), 10/7/2016; Levy, Peter B., Jeb 2016, Inc., \$2,700.00, 6/17/2015; Levy, Peter B., Donald J. Trump for President, Inc, \$2,000.00, 9/8/2016; Levy, Peter, Ryan for Congress, Inc, \$25.00, 4/13/2016; Levy, Peter B. Mr., Connecticut Republican Party, \$24.05, 11/7/2016; Levy, Peter B., Connecticut Republican Party, \$23.81, 12/21/2016; Levy, Peter B., Connecticut Republican Party, \$398.00, 4/27/2015; Levy, Peter B., Connecticut Republican Party, \$661.90, 10/17/2016; Levy, Peter B. Mr., Jeb 2016, Inc., \$(1,700.00), 9/11/2015; Levy Peter B. Mr., Jeb 2016, Inc., \$1,700.00, 7/14/2015; Levy, Peter B Mr., Republican National Committee, \$505.00, 9/12/2016; Levy, Peter B, Connecticut Republican Party, \$250.00, 1/28/2017; Levy, Peter B., Trump Victory, \$2,000.00, 11/15/2017; Levy, Peter B. Mr., NRCC, \$1,500.00, 9/25/2018; Levy, Peter B. Mr., NRCC, \$1,500.00, 9/25/2018; Levy, Peter B Mr., NRCC, \$25.00, 8/1/2018; Levy, Peter B. Mr., NRCC, \$100.00, 8/8/2018; Levy, Peter, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc, \$2,000.00, 11/15/2017; Levy, Peter B, Connecticut Republican Party, \$250.00, 6/25/2018; Levy, Peter, Mark Green for Congress, \$100.00, 1/24/2018; Levy, Peter B Mr., Rick, Scott for Florida, \$1,000.00, 10/27/2018; Levy, Peter B., Trump Victory, \$1,000.00, 11/27/2017; Levy, Peter, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc, \$300.00, 11/27/2017; Levy, Peter, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., \$700.00, 11/27/2017; Levy, Peter, Lerah Lee for Congress, \$250.00, 10/29/2019; Levy, Nan, Shaheen for Senate, \$1,500.00, 5/10/2013; Levy, Nan, Debicella for Congress 2014, \$500.00, 9/16/2014; Levy, Nan B., Connecticut Republican SCC, \$250.00, 4/11/

2014; Levy, Nan, Blumenthal for Connecticut, \$250.00, 3/31/2015; Levy, Nan B. Mrs., Jeb 2016, Inc, \$1,000.00, 7/10/2015; Levy, Nan B. Mrs., Jeb 2016, Inc., \$1,700.00, 9/11/2015; Levy, Nan, NRCC, \$1,500.00, 9/25/2018; Levy, Nan B. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$1,500.00, 4/25/2019; Levy, Nan B. Mrs., Republican National Committee, \$1,500.00, 4/25/2019; Levy, Peter B., NRSC, \$500.00, 2/11/2020; Levy, Peter B., NRSC, \$250.00, 3/11/2020; Levy, Peter B., Trump Victory, \$7,500, 2/19/2020; Levy, Peter B., Donald J. Trump for President, \$2,600, 2/19/2020.

Contributor, state committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Peter Levy, Bob for Governor, \$100.00, 8/24/2018; Peter Levy, Bob for Governor, \$2,500.00, 9/25/2018; Peter Levy, Bob for Governor, \$900.00, 11/2/2018; Peter Levy, Foley for CT, \$100.00, 2/21/2014; Peter Levy, Frantz for State Senate, \$500.00, 4/20/2018; Peter Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$60.00, 11/19/2014; Peter Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$500.00, 8/12/2015; Peter Levy, Connecticut Republican Party, \$50.00, 12/16/2019; Peter Levy, Greenwich Republican Town Committee, \$250.00, 8/12/2013; Nan Levy, Foley for CT, \$100.00, 5/6/2014.

Contributor, federal committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Levy, Michael Mr., National Republican Senatorial Committee, \$100.00, 9/15/2014; Levy, Michael Mr., National Republican Senatorial Committee, \$100.00, 10/15/2014; Levy, Michael Mr., National Republican Senatorial Committee, \$100.00, 11/15/2014; Levy, Michael Mr., National Republican Senatorial Committee, \$100.00, 2/15/2014; Levy, David A, Jeb 2016, Inc., \$2,700.00, 6/30/2015.

Contributor, state committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Michael Levy, Foley for CT, \$375.00, 1/21/2014; Michael Levy, Foley for CT, \$100.00, 3/25/2014; David Levy, Foley for CT, \$375.00, 12/31/2013; David Levy, Foley for CT, \$100.00, 3/25/2014; Benjamin Levy, Foley for CT, \$375.00, 11/23/2013; Benjamin Levy, Foley for CT, \$100.00, 3/26/2014; Benjamin Levy, Bob for Governor, \$100.00, 10/27/2018.

Contributor, federal committee/candidate, contribution amount, contribution date:

Rosenberg, Cynthia, Van Hollen for Senate, \$25.00, 11/1/2016; Rosenberg, Cynthia, Van Hollen for Senate, \$25.00, 11/1/2016; Rosenberg, Cynthia, Actblue/Van Hollen for Senate, \$25.00, 11/1/2016; Rosenberg, Cynthia, Actblue/Beto for Senate, \$50.00, 10/16/2018; Rosenberg, Cynthia, Actblue, \$5.00, 10/16/2018.

Lisa S. Kenna, of Vermont, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Peru.

Nominee: Lisa S. Kenna.

Post: Lima.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: N/A.
2. Spouse: N/A.
3. Children and Spouses: N/A.
4. Parents: N/A.
5. Grandparents: N/A.
6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.
7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

William W. Popp, of Missouri, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guatemala.

Nominee: William W. Popp.

Post: Chief of Mission to Guatemala.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Milena B. Popp: \$15, 8/23/2016, Evan McMullen.
3. Children and Spouses: Alicia Pilar B. Popp (11 yrs): None.
4. Parents: Alicia G. Werning: \$50, 09/01/2015, Bernie Sanders; \$50, 02/02/2016, Bernie Sanders; William Wallace Popp—Deceased.
5. Grandparents: Alice Sturm—Deceased; Wayne Sturm—Deceased; Helen Popp—Deceased; Wallace Popp—Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Susan A. Otero, None; Samantha J. Vogt, None.

J. Steven Dowd, of Florida, to be United States Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Ramsey Coats Day, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

C.J. Mahoney, of Kansas, to be Legal Advisor of the Department of State.

Richard M. Mills, Jr., of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

Jenny A. McGee, of Texas, to be an Associate Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Carlos Trujillo, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Western Hemisphere Affairs).

Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Shefali Agrawal and ending with Michael B. Schooling, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 29, 2020.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Anna Mae G. Akers and ending with Ismat Mohammad G. Omar Yassin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 29, 2020.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Jonathan Paul Ackley and ending with Amanda B. Whatley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 29, 2020.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Jeffrey Thomas Albanese and ending with Katherine Rose Woody, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 29, 2020.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Erin Elizabeth McKee and ending with

Dana Rogstad Mansuri, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 29, 2020.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Lawrence J. Sacks and ending with Bruce F. McFarland, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 29, 2020.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Deanna Scott and ending with Christopher Walker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 29, 2020.

By Mr. RUBIO for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

*Christopher C. Miller, of Virginia, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. REED, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4349. A bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 4350. A bill to provide immediate relief for patients from certain medical debt collection efforts during and immediately after the COVID-19 public health emergency; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. REED):

S. 4351. A bill to require States and hospitals to report COVID-19 health data directly to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 4352. A bill to provide for the water quality restoration of the Tijuana River and the New River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 4353. A bill to provide emergency assistance for independent poultry growers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 4354. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make recourse loans available to commercial processors of dairy products during the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 4355. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide benefits for lung cancer screenings for certain individuals without the imposition of cost sharing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 4356. A bill to reauthorize the Blue Ridge National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 4357. A bill to amend the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 to promote reforestation following unplanned events on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 4358. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide coverage under the Medicaid program for vaccines and treatment for COVID-19 for uninsured individuals without the imposition of cost sharing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 4359. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish a task force to identify vulnerabilities in supply chains for United States entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 4360. A bill to divert Federal funding away from supporting the presence of police in schools and toward evidence-based and trauma informed services that address the needs of marginalized students and improve academic outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 4361. A bill to automatically extend and adjust enhanced unemployment assistance for the duration of the COVID-19 emergency and economic crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 4362. A bill to prohibit water and power shutoffs during the COVID-19 emergency period, provide drinking and waste water assistance to households, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 4363. A bill to establish a presumption of occupational disease for certain employees at the Department of Energy's Radioactive Waste Management Complex, to refine the definition of compensable illnesses, to establish a research program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

S. 4364. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require online retailers to disclose whether articles sold by such retailers originate in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN:

S. 4365. A bill to clarify licensure requirements for contractor medical professionals to perform medical disability examinations for the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 4366. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to encourage entrepreneurship training in after school programs, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 4367. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate limitations on contributions to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 4368. A bill to prepare the Strategic National Stockpile for a public health emergency and require the maintenance of a domestic supply chain for countermeasures in the stockpile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 4369. A bill to protect clean air and public health by expanding fenceline and ambient air monitoring and access to air quality information for communities affected by air pollution; to require immediate toxic air monitoring at the fenceline of facilities with pollution linked to local health threats; to ensure the Environmental Protection Agency promulgates rules that require fenceline air monitoring in communities with air polluting industrial source categories; to expand and strengthen the national ambient air quality monitoring network; to deploy air sensors in communities affected by air pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 663. A resolution supporting mask-wearing as an important measure to limit the spread of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 393

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 393, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices and judges of the courts of the United States.

S. 624

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 624, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight".

S. 849

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms.

ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 849, a bill to provide for the inclusion on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall of the names of the lost crew members of the U.S.S. Frank E. Evans killed on June 3, 1969.

S. 1071

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1071, a bill to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 1083

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1083, a bill to address the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865 and to establish a commission to study and consider a national apology and proposal for reparations for the institution of slavery, its subsequent de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African-Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African-Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes.

S. 2226

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2226, a bill to require States to carry out congressional redistricting in accordance with plans developed and enacted into law by independent redistricting commissions, and for other purposes.

S. 2238

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2238, a bill to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections, and for other purposes.

S. 2525

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2525, a bill to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to conduct a study of personal protective equipment worn by firefighters to determine the prevalence and concentration of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes.

S. 2669

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2669, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes.

S. 2741

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2741, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 2876

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2876, a bill to provide economic empowerment opportunities in the United States through the modernization of public housing, and for other purposes.

S. 3353

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3353, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients, and for other purposes.

S. 3455

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3455, a bill to prohibit certain individuals from downloading or using TikTok on any device issued by the United States or a government corporation.

S. 3595

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3595, a bill to require a longitudinal study on the impact of COVID-19.

S. 3656

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3656, a bill to authorize a comprehensive, strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to strengthen global health security, and for other purposes.

S. 3672

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3672, a bill to provide States and Indian Tribes with flexibility in administering the temporary assistance for needy families program due to the public health emergency with respect to the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19), to make emergency grants to States and Indian Tribes to provide financial support for low-income individuals affected by that public health emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 3705

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3705, a bill to establish a private-public partnership to preserve jobs in the aviation manufacturing industry, and for other purposes.

S. 3737

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3737, a bill to improve the public health workforce loan repayment program.

S. 3814

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3814, a bill to establish a loan program for businesses affected by COVID-19 and to extend the loan forgiveness period for paycheck protection program loans made to the hardest hit businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 4034

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4034, a bill to expand eligibility for and provide judicial review for the Elderly Home Detention Pilot Program, provide for compassionate release based on COVID-19 vulnerability, shorten the waiting period for judicial review during the COVID-19 pandemic, and make other technical corrections.

S. 4042

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4042, a bill to protect agricultural workers from the impacts of the coronavirus pandemic, and for other purposes.

S. 4075

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4075, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide for the release of certain Federal interests in connection with certain grants under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4098

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 4098, a bill to provide funding for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4129

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4129, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate advance refunding bonds.

S. 4143

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4143, a bill to extend the unemployment insurance provisions of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act for the duration of the economic recovery, and for other purposes.

S. 4172

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island

(Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4172, a bill to provide emergency funding for child welfare services provided under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4174

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 4174, a bill to provide emergency appropriations to the United States Postal Service to cover losses related to the COVID-19 crisis and to direct the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service to develop a plan for ensuring the long term solvency of the Postal Service.

S. 4181

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4181, a bill to establish a Library Stabilization Fund to respond to and accelerate the recovery from coronavirus.

S. 4198

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4198, a bill to require health plans to provide coverage for COVID-19 serology testing.

S. 4202

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4202, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to expand online benefit redemption options under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 4226

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 4226, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of establishing a fund for the response to, and recovery from, a cyber state of distress, and for other purposes.

S. 4227

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4227, a bill to improve access to economic injury disaster loans and emergency advances under the CARES Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4231

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4231, a bill to strengthen and sustain on-shore manufacturing capacity and State stockpiles, and to improve the Strategic National Stockpile.

S. 4252

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Is-

land (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4252, a bill to provide funding for States to improve their unemployment compensation programs, and for other purposes.

S. 4283

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4283, a bill to provide funding for States to improve their unemployment insurance technology systems, and for other purposes.

S. 4338

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4338, a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to temporarily suspend increased line speeds at meat and poultry establishments, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 509

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 509, a resolution calling upon the United Nations Security Council to adopt a resolution on Iran that extends the dates by which Annex B restrictions under Resolution 2231 are currently set to expire.

S. RES. 652

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 652, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding preconditions for the readmission of the Russian Federation into a reconstituted Group of Eight or participation in the Group of Seven.

S. RES. 658

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 658, a resolution calling for a free, fair, and transparent presidential election in Belarus taking place on August 9, 2020, including the unimpeded participation of all presidential candidates.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. Kaine (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. REED, and Mr. CASIDY):

S. 4349. A bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, Lorna Breen was a talented and dynamic physician who served as the medical director of the emergency department at New York-Presbyterian Allen Hospital. Lorna was from Charlottesville, VA, and very devoted to her family there. She attended Cornell University and then the Medical College of Virginia. She was deeply religious, an avid skier, a volunteer with senior citizens, a salsa dancer, and a musician.

Mostly, Lorna Breen was a beloved, compassionate, and demanding doctor. A colleague said of her: “She had something that was a little bit different and that was this optimism that her persistent effort will save lives.”

Dr. Breen suffered from something very common among health professionals—the deep stress of dealing with patients day in and day out—helping them, worrying about them, celebrating with them, praying for them, and mourning for them.

Healthcare professionals routinely experience high levels of stress. As many as 45 to 55 percent of this critical workforce suffers from burnout. Physicians have the highest rate of death by suicide of any profession in this country, with a suicide rate more than twice that of the general population. That was the case before COVID-19.

In November 2019, Dr. Breen and three colleagues published a short article in the *American Journal of Emergency Medicine* titled: “Clinician burnout and its association with team-based care in the Emergency Department.” The article that she coauthored begins this way:

Recent work has noted the alarming prevalence of clinician burnout among providers, particularly among acute care physicians. Burnout is characterized by emotional exhaustion, physical fatigue, and cognitive weariness, which may lead to feelings of depersonalization and reduced accomplishment.

The article went on to describe how staffing models—in this case, the use of fixed working teams—could mitigate the effects of stress on staff and also improve patient outcomes. Within just a few months of the publication of this article, healthcare professionals like Dr. Breen, already dealing with high stress levels, faced a new foe: coronavirus.

Dr. Breen’s hospital was overrun by the virus in March and April, as were others in New York, as are others in this country. By late March, the Allen, a small community hospital serving a low-income population in Northern Manhattan, was blitzed with an emergency department clogged with nearly three times its normal number of patients. Dr. Breen shared the sense of anxiety now understood by the whole country: “People I work with are so confused by all the mixed messages and constantly changing instructions.” And then Dr. Breen got the virus herself, coming down with fever and exhaustion on March 18 and quarantining in her New York City apartment as she tried to recover. While she was trying to recover, she was texting her colleagues to see if they were OK. She was trying to help them find supplies that they could buy to use at the hospital.

Finally, she returned to work on April 1, and the situation in her emergency room, her hospital, her city, was even grimmer. Her sister, Jennifer Breen Feist, described what Lorna faced.

When [Lorna] returned to the hospital, she was confronted by an overwhelming, relent-

less number of incredibly sick patients. She and her colleagues worked 24/7 during the peak in New York with limited personal protective equipment, insufficient supplies, not enough beds, not enough help. Many of her colleagues were out on medical furlough. She told me patients were dying in the waiting rooms and hallways. . . . There was so much suffering, so much death.

During the peak of the crisis in New York City, nearly a quarter of all patients admitted to the Allen for COVID-19 would die. Dr. Breen messaged her Bible study group: “I’m drowning right now—may be AWOL for a while.” She kept right on working.

By mid-April, Dr. Breen reached out for help to deal with the stress she was feeling by talking to colleagues and family. She admitted that she had thought about hurting herself. She told one friend:

I couldn’t help anyone. I couldn’t do anything. I just wanted to help people and I couldn’t do anything.

Dr. Breen was admitted to a psychiatric hospital for 11 days and went home when she was discharged to be with her family in Charlottesville to recover, and on April 26, Dr. Breen died by suicide, leaving no note.

Dr. Breen was a victim of coronavirus, even though her death is not counted among the 151,000 people who have succumbed to the virus. But she was also a victim of another condition that is a preventable condition that affects our healthcare professionals. We place enormous demands upon our healers. Our society, including the medical profession itself, does not do enough to recognize the real cost that the work inflicts upon the mental health of our caregivers. Perhaps even our use of the term “hero,” meant as the highest praise, subtly communicates an expectation that our healers must be strong superheroes, placed high on a pedestal by society, thereby making it even more difficult for a caregiver to admit vulnerability and simply ask for help.

Loice Swisher, an emergency room physician in Philadelphia, puts it this way:

We don’t want to be seen as a weak link. We don’t want to be seen as incompetent or place an extra burden on our colleagues. It’s almost like you’re being kicked off the island—you don’t belong any more—if you admit to [needing help].

It is still common practice in this country for State medical boards and hospitals to ask doctors seeking licensing and credentialing whether they have ever been treated for depression or other mental illness. This heightens the barriers to asking for help when we should be making it easier to do so. Lorna’s sister Jennifer attests to this:

And when [Lorna] became so overworked and despondent that she was unable to move, do you know what she was worried about? Her job. She was worried that she would lose her medical license, or be ostracized by her colleagues because she was suffering burnout due to her work on the front lines of the Covid19 crisis. She was afraid to get help.

Lorna’s worries were not unusual. A 2019 survey of physicians by the Amer-

ican Medical Association showed that nearly 40 percent of surveyed physicians are wary about seeking mental health counseling, while another 12 percent indicate that they would only do so in secret.

Dr. Breen’s family is devastated by her passing, but they are honoring her by advocating for the cause of a more humane profession, one in which mental health challenges are acknowledged, mental health resources are available, and the healer accessing those services is encouraged.

I am proud today to introduce the Dr. Lorna Breen Health Care Provider Protection Act, together with my colleagues, Senators YOUNG, REED, and CASSIDY. The act aims to reduce and prevent suicide, burnout, and other mental and behavioral health conditions among healthcare professionals. In particular, the act would establish grants for training healthcare professionals, students, and residents with strategies to improve their mental well-being and job satisfaction; identify and disseminate evidence-based best practices for combating burnout and suicide; establish a national education and awareness campaign targeting healthcare professionals to encourage them to seek support and treatment for mental and behavioral health concerns; create grants for employee education, peer support programming, and mental and behavioral health treatment with a priority for providers in COVID-19 hotspots; and initiate a comprehensive study on healthcare professional mental health needs, including the impact of COVID-19 on our providers, that can produce recommendations for all levels of government and the medical professions themselves.

We introduced this bill mindful of the many priorities that are currently being discussed while we negotiate our continuing response to the Nation’s coronavirus challenge. It is our hope that this bill might make it into the next COVID-19 bill as a tribute to Lorna Breen and so many like her.

How should we honor the work and sacrifice of a Lorna Breen? How do we honor those healthcare frontline workers whom we call heroes every day? How do we recognize the tremendous work they are doing and also the tremendous burden that they carry? Let’s pass this bill and show that we care about our healers and are committed to providing them the resources and the culture they need to keep healing.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 4352. A bill to provide for the water quality restoration of the Tijuana River and the New River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the “Border Water Quality Restoration and Protection Act of 2020.”

For over two decades, cleaning up the Tijuana River Valley has been one of

my top priorities for Southern California. The wastewater, trash and sediment that continues to flow into San Diego and Imperial Counties is a danger to public health and our economy and it must be addressed.

This legislation is a key piece of addressing this decades-long issue.

WHAT THE PROBLEM IS

Polluted water from the Tijuana and New Rivers flows north across the border into the United States causing unsanitary water conditions, pollution and beach closures across Southern California. It also jeopardizes military training exercises for Navy Seals in Camp Pendleton.

Three-quarters of the 1,700-square-mile Tijuana River watershed lies in Mexico. However, the watershed, along with all its pollutants, drains into San Diego County and the Tijuana River Valley.

IMPACTS OF THE WATER POLLUTION

In addition to jeopardizing human health and safety, two of the most drastic effects from this cross-border water pollution are harm to wildlife and damage to the tourism industry, integral to Southern Californian communities.

Pollution from Mexico harms sensitive areas that provide critical habitat for more than 300 species of birds as well as marine animals like leopard sharks and bottlenose dolphins, including: Tijuana River's National Estuarine Research Reserve, the River Mouth State Marine Conservation Area and River Valley Regional Park Preserve.

The beaches in the region are vital to San Diego's tourism economy. Beaches in the communities of Coronado and Imperial Beach have been closed for more than 200 days this year alone due to pollution.

Health and safety of residents and workers are also at risk. In recent years, local Border Patrol union officials reported that 80 officers suffered from contamination, rashes, infections, chemical burns and lung irritation due to toxic cross-border flows.

The harmful effects of pollution in the Tijuana River Valley on our residents, businesses, economy and environment are simply unacceptable.

CURRENT STATUS

In February 2020, the Government Accountability Office issued a comprehensive report, "International Boundary Water Commission: Opportunities Exist to Address Water Quality Problems." My office worked closely with the GAO to utilize their findings to craft meaningful change through this legislation.

Simultaneously, we were able to secure \$300 million in the U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement to address pollution in the Tijuana River Valley Watershed.

With significant funding and detailed findings by the GAO investigation, we developed this legislation in concert with federal, state and local agency input.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

The Border Water Quality Restoration and Protection Act includes some key reforms to advance concrete solutions.

One of the problems is that no one agency is in charge of this problem. A whole range of agencies—EPA, International Boundary and Water Commission, State Department, Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection, Defense Department—all have jurisdiction or interest in this international issue.

What we need is one agency in charge, taking input from the others so decisions can be made. This approach is similar to other large, regional environmental challenges like the Great Lakes, Gulf of Mexico, Everglades and Chesapeake Bay. Here in California, we have also seen great success with this model of interagency coordination at Lake Tahoe.

Here's how the bill would work:

The EPA would be officially named the agency with overall control of this effort.

The EPA, along with its federal, state and local partners, would be directed to identify a list of priority projects. It also would be authorized to accept and distribute funds to build, operate and maintain those projects.

Would permanently authorize the Border Water Infrastructure Program to manage storm water runoff and water reuse projects.

State and local authorities would also be authorized to contribute funding to federal projects, which is currently not allowed.

The International Boundary and Water Commission would be authorized to mitigate storm water from Mexico and the pollution that comes with it and is required to construct, operate and maintain projects on the priority list developed by the agencies within the U.S. that improve water quality.

CONCLUSION

We need a new and comprehensive approach to this issue that has plagued border communities for too long. This bill creates a formal process to consider effective, long-term solutions and additional wastewater infrastructure to mitigate cross-border pollution and I hope the Senate can move on this bill quickly.

I want to thank California Environmental Protection Agency, California Natural Resources Agency, San Diego and Imperial counties, cities of Imperial Beach and Coronado, Mayor of Chula Vista, Mary Casillas Salas, Mayor of San Diego, Kevin Faulconer, and the Port of San Diego for supporting this legislation. These communities, and others, have been negatively impacted by this issue for far too long.

It's past time that we finally solve this problem to safeguard local health and economic growth.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the Floor.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 4361. A bill to automatically extend and adjust enhanced unemployment assistance for the duration of the COVID-19 emergency and economic crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the unemployment crisis we are facing due to the pandemic has devastated the lives of tens of millions of Americans—many of whom may not see their jobs come back for the foreseeable future. The expanded unemployment insurance we passed in the CARES Act—especially the coverage for gig workers and the self-employed and the \$600 weekly boost—have enabled workers to keep a roof over their heads, feed their children, and pay for health insurance.

If these benefits expire or are drastically reduced, it could cause an eviction and hunger crisis. It could also tank consumer spending while increasing business closings that will lead to even more unemployment. Additionally, it could further exacerbate this public health and economic crisis by forcing more Americans into desperate situations, instead of ensuring that people can return to the workforce when it is safe.

And yet knowing this, the Republican have proposed to slash weekly benefits to \$200 a week for the next two months, after which benefits would be limited to no more than 70% of previous wages. This plan, which would cut the average worker's unemployment benefits by roughly 43%, would take states months to get up and running. This would further delay benefits at a time when some workers are still waiting for assistance.

Instead of this half-baked, inefficient, and disingenuous proposal, we must work together on a bipartisan basis to enact targeted, effective, and smart measures that will offer families, businesses, and the economy the needed stability to get us through this crisis. That is why I am introducing the Worker Relief and Security Act, along with Senator BENNET and Congressman BEYER. Our legislation, which reflects input from top economists, would take politics out of the equation, basing continued enhanced unemployment insurance benefits on "automatic stabilizers" that are tied to the public health emergency and economic conditions. Specifically, this legislation would automatically extend the \$600 weekly boost and additional benefit weeks, on top of regular state unemployment, through the duration of the public health crisis. Once we begin to enter the recovery phase, this legislation would continue providing supplemental weekly compensation and additional benefit weeks until national and state total unemployment rates get closer to pre-crisis levels.

Time is of the essence, so I urge our colleagues to join us in pressing for immediate action on this legislation. We must extend and enhance unemployment insurance benefits, tying them to economic and health conditions—as

well as expand work sharing as I have discussed previously—to help keep families, businesses, and states solvent through this crisis.

Mr. President, I yield back.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 663—SUPPORTING MASK-WEARING AS AN IMPORTANT MEASURE TO LIMIT THE SPREAD OF THE CORONAVIRUS DISEASE 2019 (COVID-19)

Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 663

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention believes that the spread of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (referred to in this preamble as “COVID-19”) occurs primarily through respiratory droplets;

Whereas research shows that shedding of the virus that causes COVID-19 can occur 2 to 3 days before the onset of symptoms;

Whereas research conducted long before the COVID-19 pandemic has shown the utility of wearing masks in providing protection against the transmission of respiratory infections;

Whereas various types of cloth masks, including masks made of cotton, gauze, and other fabrics, reduced infection rates among health care workers and others during the Spanish Flu pandemic of 1918 and the Manchurian plague of 1920 through 1921, and were used by health care workers and others to protect against tuberculosis in the 1930s and 1940s;

Whereas a study published on July 9, 2008, that tested the efficacy of homemade face masks in reducing respiratory infections among the general population concluded that any type of general-use mask is likely to decrease viral exposure and infection risk on a population level;

Whereas a study published on May 22, 2013, that attempted to test the protective value of homemade masks compared to commercial masks in an influenza pandemic concluded that homemade masks would be better than no facial protection at all;

Whereas, on April 3, 2020, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommended that the people of the United States wear nonmedical, cloth masks in public places;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has found that cloth face coverings fashioned from household items can substantially reduce the dispersion of exhaled droplets and provide acceptable breathability;

Whereas a survey conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention from May 11 through May 13, 2020, found that 76 percent of adults support mask-wearing outside of the home;

Whereas a study published by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on July 17, 2020, found no secondary cases of COVID-19 in 139 mask-wearing clients of 2 symptomatic mask-wearing hair stylists with confirmed cases of COVID-19;

Whereas the benefit of each additional cloth mask worn by members of the public has been estimated to be between \$3,000 and \$6,000 due to the ability of masks to slow COVID-19 transmission and, as a result, to

decrease mortality relating to the virus that causes COVID-19; and

Whereas a study published in BMJ found that mask-wearing by both infected individuals and the contacts of those individuals to be 79 percent effective in reducing COVID-19 transmission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of mask-wearing in limiting the transmission of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (referred to in this resolution as “COVID-19”);

(2) recognizes that medical-grade masks should be reserved for use in health care settings and among vulnerable populations throughout the COVID-19 pandemic;

(3) recognizes that mask-wearing should be coupled with other measures recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and State and local public health agencies, including frequent handwashing and physical distancing, to further reduce the risk of COVID-19 transmission; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to wear masks in indoor public places, in accordance with the guidelines established by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, at times when physical distancing is not allowable to protect against unknown transmission of COVID-19.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2020, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29,

2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 29, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

FRIENDLY AIRPORTS FOR MOTHERS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 479, S. 2638.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2638) to amend title 49, United States Code, to require small hub airports to construct areas for nursing mothers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. PORTMAN. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2638) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2638

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Friendly Airports for Mothers Improvement Act”.

SEC. 2. MOTHERS' ROOMS.

Section 47107(w) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “In fiscal year 2021” and all that follows through “the Secretary of Transportation” and inserting “The Secretary of Transportation”;

(2) in paragraph (1)(B) by striking “one men's and one women's” and inserting “at least one men's and at least one women's”;

(3) by striking paragraph (2)(A) and inserting the following:

“(A) AIRPORT SIZE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The requirements in paragraph (1) shall only apply to applications submitted by the airport sponsor of—

“(I) a medium or large hub airport in fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter; and

“(II) an applicable small hub airport in fiscal year 2023 and each fiscal year thereafter.

“(ii) APPLICABLE SMALL HUB AIRPORT DEFINED.—In clause (i)(II), the term ‘applicable small hub airport’ means an airport designated as a small hub airport during—

“(I) the 3-year period consisting of 2020, 2021, and 2022; or

“(II) any consecutive 3-year period beginning after 2020.”;

(4) in paragraph (2)(B) by striking “the date of enactment of this Act complies with the requirement in paragraph (1)” and inserting “October 5, 2018, complies with the requirement in paragraph (1)(A)”; and

(5) in paragraph (2)(C) by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(A)”.

TRAVELING PARENTS SCREENING CONSISTENCY ACT OF 2019

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 489, S. 2381.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2381) to require review by the Government Accountability Office of screening protocols of the Transportation Security Administration relating to breast milk and formula, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Traveling Parents Screening Consistency Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION BY TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION OF SCREENING PROTOCOLS RELATING TO BREAST MILK AND FORMULA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of—

(1) the implementation by the Transportation Security Administration (in this section referred to as “TSA”) of the Bottles and Breastfeeding Equipment Screening Act (Public Law 114–293; 49 U.S.C. 44901 note); and

(2) the effectiveness of TSA in ensuring the clarity of screening protocols relating to, and the consistency of screening of, breast milk and other liquids for the consumption of infants, including formula, purified deionized water, and juice.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The review required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of—
(A) whether TSA effectively manages the consistency of the application of protocols to the screening of breast milk and other liquids described in subsection (a)(2);

(B) the need for TSA to update and revise procedures for screening breast milk and other liquids described in subsection (a)(2);

(C) whether TSA effectively tracks passenger complaints related to such screening to monitor trends and identify inconsistencies;

(D) the practices of TSA with respect to communications and information sharing with passengers, air carriers, and airports relating to protocols for such screening; and

(E) the policies of TSA regarding the screening of passengers with nursing products, including the extent to which such passengers are more likely to receive secondary screening; and

(2) make recommendations for improving the practices of TSA relating to such screening.

Mr. PORTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2381), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 30, 2020

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, July 30; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Kan nomination under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:44 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 30, 2020, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CRAIG DUEHRING, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE LAURA JUNOR, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

GREGORY AUTRY, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, VICE JEFFREY DEWIT, RESIGNED.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

ROBERT E. PRIMUS, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2022, VICE DEBRA L. MILLER, TERM EXPIRED.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

THEODORE ROKITA, OF INDIANA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 3, 2021, VICE DEREK TAI-CHING KAN.

THEODORE ROKITA, OF INDIANA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 3, 2026. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

MARK C. CHRISTIE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2025, VICE BERNARD L. MCNAMEE, TERM EXPIRED.

ALLISON CLEMENTS, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2024, VICE CHERYL A. LAFLEUR, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DOUGLAS MACGREGOR, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY.

ERIC M. UELAND, OF OREGON, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (CIVILIAN SECURITY, DEMOCRACY, AND HUMAN RIGHTS), VICE SARAH SEWALL, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 29, 2020:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

MARVIN KAPLAN, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2025.

LAUREN MCGARITY MCFERRAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2024.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on July 29, 2020 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

ROBERT E. PRIMUS, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2023, VICE DANIEL R. ELLIOTT III, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JULY 21, 2020.